

# **MISSOURI**

# **SOLID WASTE ADVISORY BOARD**

## **ANNUAL REPORT FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2021**

---

November 3, 2021

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Annual Report Requirement .....	1
What's in this Report .....	1
Prior SWAB Legislative Recommendations for Joint Committee Consideration .....	1
1.0 MDNR Technical Assistance Program .....	2
2.0 Solid Waste Management Issues.....	3
Funding.....	3
Recycling Infrastructure and Markets .....	4
RECYCLING MARKET VOLATILITY .....	4
Increase Investment to Develop End-Use Markets .....	4
Hard-to-handle Materials.....	5
Scrap Tires.....	5
Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) .....	5
Electronic Waste .....	6
Pharmaceuticals.....	6
Shingles .....	6
Glass.....	7
Lithium Ion Batteries.....	7
3.0 Proposed Rules and Regulations .....	7
4.0 Grant Award Criteria.....	8
Grant Award Criteria .....	8
Recycling Program Benefits.....	9
5.0 Waste Management Issues.....	9
Right to Repair.....	10
Market Development .....	10



Product stewardship .....	10
Affordable recovery and recycling of illegally dumped scrap tires .....	11
Inadequate Resources to Address Closed Landfills with Environmental Issues.....	11
6.0 New Technologies and Improved Methods.....	11
Local and State Policies .....	11
Food Waste .....	12
Organic Waste .....	12
Extended Producer Responsibility/Product Stewardship .....	12
7.0 Unfunded Solid Waste Management Projects .....	13
8.0 Other Matters.....	13
Education/awarness programs to Reduce contamination in recycling.....	13
Local Control .....	13
Waste Diversion Goal .....	14
Waste Diversion Measurement.....	14
Maintain the Ban on Yard Waste in Landfills .....	15
COVID-19 pandemic .....	15
Emerging issue: Landfill closures / Landfill Capacity .....	16
Emerging issue: Plastic bags and StyroFoam.....	16

Attachment A FY2021 District Funded Projects

Attachment B FY2021 District Unfunded Projects

Attachment C Proposed Revisions: 10 CSR 80-9.050 Solid Waste Management Fund—District Grants

Attachment D 2021 SWAB Legislative Recommendations

Attachment E Comparison of Missouri Solid Waste Legislation

Attachment F Solid Waste Management Districts



MISSOURI SOLID WASTE ADVISORY BOARD

## INTRODUCTION

### ANNUAL REPORT REQUIREMENT

With the passage of SB 445, the Legislature established a requirement that the Solid Waste Advisory Board (SWAB)<sup>1</sup> submit an annual report to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) on a number of subjects, including district grant-funded and unfunded waste reduction and recycling projects. The act also requires the Board to prepare an annual report to committees in the General Assembly regarding solid waste, if any are convened. There are no standing committees at this time. This report is intended to serve both purposes. The statute requires that this report be prepared and issued on or before January 1<sup>st</sup>.

### WHAT'S IN THIS REPORT

SWAB is required to submit a report to MDNR and/or any standing, statutory, interim, or select committee or task force of the general assembly having jurisdiction over solid waste regarding:

- (1) The efficacy of MDNR's technical assistance program;
- (2) Solid waste management problems experienced by solid waste management districts;
- (3) The effects of proposed rules and regulations upon solid waste management within the districts;
- (4) Criteria to be used in awarding grants pursuant to section 260.335;
- (5) Waste management issues pertinent to the districts;
- (6) The development of improved methods of solid waste minimization, recycling and resource recovery;
- (7) Unfunded solid waste management projects; and
- (8) Such other matters as the advisory board may determine.

### PRIOR SWAB LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR JOINT COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

SWAB previously identified selected issues for discussion and action by the Joint Committee. These issues, which were transmitted to the Joint Committee in January 2016, highlighted some of the more pressing challenges and opportunities facing the districts, and identified opportunities for expanding recycling in Missouri. These initial issues are repeated within this document. In 2020 an updated list was presented to the Joint Committee. It is Attachment E at the end of this document.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Solid Waste Advisory Board (SWAB) is made up of the chairperson of each of the 20 Solid Waste Management Districts or their designee. Five additional members are appointed by the director of the Missouri Department of Natural Resources' Waste Management Program. Two represent the solid waste management industry, one represents the composting or recycling industry and two are public members who have demonstrated interest in solid waste management issues.



## 1.0 MDNR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Since the passage of SB 530, the solid waste management districts have developed expertise and understanding around local solid waste management needs. However, waste management and recycling are national and global efforts. Many areas of the country, and the world, are ahead of Missouri in setting the tone for the future of waste reduction and recycling. From anaerobic digestion to zero waste initiatives, other countries and U.S. cities and businesses are implementing new and innovative ways to manage wastes and advance the concept of a circular economy. To continue to advance Missouri's recycling industry, it is essential that national and global trends be tracked and data disseminated.

MDNR can play a vital role in ensuring that the districts have the research and tools, including data, needed for good planning and implementing solutions at the local level. MDNR leadership is critical on four levels:

1. Providing regulatory oversight like illegal dumping, permitting for solid waste disposal and processing facilities, and enforcement actions.
2. Analyzing data, trends, and innovations in all areas of integrated solid waste management, not only landfills, with an emphasis on waste reduction and recycling.
3. Monitoring national recycling trends and practices and disseminating information to districts, businesses and organizations to strengthen Missouri's recycling industry.
4. Providing education and technical assistance for potential implementation of emerging waste reduction and recycling strategies such as product stewardship and extended producer responsibility.

MDNR does not currently have a Technical Assistance Program for waste reduction and recycling programs, which could be highly beneficial for both districts and expanding recycling across the state. Individual districts do not have the resources to conduct this research and create this programming on their own. With over 50% of Missouri waste now being managed by means other than landfilling, there are significant benefits that could occur through an active Waste Reduction and Recycling Technical Assistance Program. Within a Technical Assistance Program, MDNR could:

- Conduct research
- Collect and disseminate program data
- Provide training and certifications
- Conduct educational programs
- Investigate best practices for recycling issues, promote public awareness
- Maintain database and informational resources

In the 2016 annual report, SWAB recommended that MDNR begin to establish a program during 2017. To this date, no action has been taken on the Technical Assistance Program due to limited staff and funding resources within the Waste Management Program. The following recommendations are again repeated in this report.

The first step would be to establish a Waste Reduction and Recycling Unit within the MDNR Waste Management Program. As a suggestion, the unit could include two recycling specialists (a Program Specialist and an Associate Research/Data Analyst) and a unit chief. This would greatly increase the ability of MDNR to be proactive in providing information and assistance to support Districts and others working to expand recycling throughout the state.



Establishing a recycling unit and creating the associated positions would allow MDNR to better accomplish its mission to expand waste reduction and recycling in Missouri. SWAB encourages MDNR to initiate an effective and efficient Waste Reduction and Recycling Technical Assistance Program as soon as possible. Statewide solid waste planning and technical assistance could be further enhanced by establishing deliberate policy, planning and outreach linkages with other statewide programs related to topics such as air and water quality, energy efficiency and conservation and natural hazard mitigation.

## 2.0 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

The districts were each asked to select one or two waste management issues facing their district for inclusion in this report. Most of the issues identified by the districts fall into the following categories:

- Funding
- Recycling infrastructure and markets
- Material specific issues

### FUNDING

The current Missouri tonnage fee of \$2.11 per ton is a reasonable commitment that funds the recycling and waste reduction activities of the Districts. The fee was initially set at \$1.50 per ton, with a Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustment for inflation. By 2005, the fee had risen to \$2.11 per ton, but the CPI adjustment was frozen through additional legislation and will continue to remain at \$2.11 per ton until 2027.

The total tonnage fee is allocated as follows: An initial amount of \$200,000 (for Hold Harmless Funds for Solid Waste Management Districts receiving less funds under the current SB225 distribution funding formula than under the prior SB530 formula), and \$800,000 to the EIERA is allocated and, the remaining amount is divided 61% going to the Solid Waste Management Districts and 39% going towards regulation, compliance assistance, permitting, and enforcement activities of MDNR. The funding for the Solid Waste Management Districts and EIERA programs represent 64%, or approximately \$1.35 per ton, of the current \$2.11 tonnage fee. The vast majority of the tonnage fees come in under the \$2.11 fee for sanitary and transfer stations shipping their waste out of state (other funds include a \$1.40 per ton fees paid by demolition landfills). Also, the above breakdown is based off the current annual tonnage fee total of approximately \$13 million.

Like many other public agencies, the Districts and MDNR, are consistently being asked to do more with less. This is especially true in rural areas where the quantity of recyclable materials and logistics make collecting and processing recyclables increasingly more difficult. The end result is that geographically, large areas of the state are left without reasonable means to recycle and the districts have inadequate resources and staff to support the necessary infrastructure.

Two changes would be highly beneficial to expand program resources. One method of maintaining the purchasing power of solid waste funds would be to reinstate the inflation adjuster to index the tonnage fee to the Consumer Price Index. This would require a statutory action to reinstate the CPI annual adjustment that provides the Districts and MDNR with a hedge against inflation and rising operation expenses. Also, annual grant requests greatly exceed



available funds and additional funding would generate significant returns for communities and businesses across Missouri. Increasing program resources helps expand our economy, improve our communities, and protect our environment.

## RECYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE AND MARKETS

### RECYCLING MARKET VOLATILITY

Recycling succeeds when there are businesses to buy the collected materials and reprocess them. Much of the material collected in Missouri is delivered to markets outside of the state. National recycling markets have experienced a downward trend for several years, depressing the business of recycling and driving some recycling enterprises out of business. Fortunately, markets have rebounded and the markets for recovered materials is currently quite strong.

Prior to the COVID pandemic, the global recycling market was still struggling as a result of actions taken by China beginning in late 2017 to reduce the volume of contaminated recovered materials being shipped to that country. This ban has adversely affected recycling programs across the United States and in Missouri. Tremendous effort has gone into reducing contamination and expanding domestic US markets to meet the challenges posed by China's National Sword policy. These efforts continue to improve recycling processes overall. Smaller, more rural recyclers have suffered a greater impact than larger recyclers who have more resources.

The pandemic itself initially created an artificial shortage of recyclables, due to temporary closures of recycling centers and programs. As programs and collections have resumed, the problem of limited end-users remains.

Several of the more rural Districts continue to deal with aging infrastructure and often the local sheltered workshop serves as the recycling processor for the region. In many instances, the sheltered workshops have stopped accepting certain recyclable materials; limiting the list of materials they accept to paper, cardboard and aluminum. Recently some workshops have closed their doors, while others have halted all recycling operations.

The improved recycling market conditions are helping businesses to expand their recycling efforts. Keeping the recovered materials clean is important to minimize the impact of recycling market swings in the future.

### INCREASE INVESTMENT TO DEVELOP END-USE MARKETS

Making new products from recycled materials is a strong economic development opportunity that can generate good-paying Missouri jobs. However, the Missouri Market Development Program has very limited funding. Program resources should be significantly increased to support the growth of end-users in Missouri. Recycling produces commodities that feed into a global marketplace, and are subject to fluctuations in price and demand. Developing strong, local end-use markets for recovered materials generated in Missouri would help recyclers weather market fluctuations. Expanding the Missouri Market Development program administered by the Environmental Improvement and Energy Resources Authority (EIERA) would create local jobs and provide a significant return on investment. The Market Development Program needs much greater resources to help recycling continue to grow through the creation of value-added products made in Missouri.



## HARD-TO-HANDLE MATERIALS

The Districts have often provided the only opportunity to the general public for the safe and environmentally responsible disposal of household hazardous waste, electronics, small quantities of illegally dumped scrap tires, and other items not appropriate to landfill. In general, these materials are difficult to manage, expensive to properly take care of, and lack the needed policies and/or fees to create incentives for residents and the solid waste industry to properly handle them. This situation leaves the cost of proper disposal on citizens, solid waste management districts, and local governments. The Districts identified the following materials as problematic.

### SCRAP TIRES

While several options exist for the proper disposal of scrap tires, including local retailers, illegal disposal of scrap tires continues to be an issue for the state. Scrap tire stockpiles are unsightly, pose a fire hazard, and provide breeding grounds for mosquitoes and vermin. While MDNR works with charitable, fraternal, and other nonprofit organizations to complete the necessary cleanup work for sites with less than 500 scrap tires; illegal scrap tire stockpiles cost municipalities and private property owners significant dollars each year to clean up.

The elimination of the Scrap Tire Roundup Program in April of 2016 was distressing to the districts because under current law they cannot provide funding to assist local governments in the disposal of scrap tires. They continue to address scrap tires as best they can, but as end markets for scrap tires continue to dry up, it is likely that scrap tires will continue to remain an issue for the districts. The challenge remains to find a long-term, cost-effective, and affordable solution that avoids abuse of assistance programs by entities that are involved in the generation of scrap tires and that also does not circumvent the existing retail collection system.

### HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE (HHW)

There is a continued need across the state for convenient access to programs for the proper management of HHW, which includes products such as household cleaners, lawn and garden products, automotive fluids, paints and paint-related products.

Several Districts currently provide HHW collection programs to varying degrees ranging from one-day collection events to semi-permanent and permanent facilities. Most Districts also agree that one-day collection events can be costly and offer a very limited window of opportunity for participation. Districts that do not offer programs often find it difficult to find locations, support and funding for facilities and events.

Those Districts that offer HHW collection programs find that latex and oil based paints often make up the greatest HHW expense. Paint creates issues for all HHW facilities in the state and each facility has had to deal with it in different ways. Ten states and the District of Columbia have adopted product stewardship legislation for paint via an industry-backed and funded organization, Paintcare. Implementing product stewardship legislation and programming would free up funds for other waste diversion activities, make paint recycling more convenient for residents, and help Missouri gain experience with a successful product stewardship program that could be a model for recovering other challenging hard to handle materials. The Missouri Product Stewardship Council's Paint Committee has gathered data and is conducting outreach in an effort to create a paint stewardship program in Missouri. The workgroup has drafted legislation and plans to submit it during the 2022 legislative session.



## ELECTRONIC WASTE

Electronic waste continues to be a growing problem. Rapid advances in technology mean that electronic products are becoming obsolete more quickly. This, coupled with explosive sales in consumer electronics, means that more products are being disposed of, even if they still work. With the increase in remote work application during the pandemic electronic sales increased further.

Recycling electronics is not like recycling traditional recyclables, since these products are not easy to recycle. For example, monitors and televisions made with tubes (not flat panels) contain lead, and proper and safe recycling is costly.

In rural areas, the cost associated with electronics recycling is a hindrance for many residents. As stated by one district “there are too many opportunities to store or dump the materials on one’s property.”

## PHARMACEUTICALS

The proper disposal of pharmaceuticals is becoming an issue in some regions, particularly those with numerous medical centers and an aging population. Almost all medicines can be safely disposed of through U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) authorized collection events; however, these events are periodic and may not reach all areas of the state. Other options for pharmaceutical management, such as HHW collection programs, are not well known to residents, are costly for Districts to fund, and cannot accept all pharmaceuticals, such as narcotics and opiates, due to federal drug enforcement rules.

The Missouri Product Stewardship Council has identified pharmaceuticals as a target material. In 2021 the PSC Pharmaceuticals Committee developed a social media campaign aimed at educating the public about proper disposal of medicine. The campaign ran in June and again in October. The committee also developed a statewide, interactive map of permanent drug take-back locations. The link to this map was made available through the social media campaign and materials developed by the committee are available on the Missouri PSC website. The PSC is partnering with Inmar in an effort to encourage 17 additional pharmacies in underserved areas of the state to join a permanent take-back program. These efforts are underway in the fall of 2021.

## SHINGLES

Asphalt is one of the most common materials used in roofing shingles and as such shingles have the potential for reuse in public paving projects. Where options exist for shingle recycling, the districts are challenged to promote these programs, because from a roofer’s perspective, recycling shingles is more expensive and time consuming than taking them to the area landfills.

However, some of the Districts are noting an increase in shingle disposal. Some of the asphalt companies have decreased the amount of shingles they purchase or have eliminated the purchase of shingles altogether. While the reason for the decline is not fully known, it is likely that:

- The decline in oil prices has reduced incentives to incorporate shingles into paving mixes.
- The paving industry has not rebounded quite as fast as construction, in general.
- Speculative accumulation of asphalt shingles has become a problem with shingles collected with good intention but having nowhere to go, they sit in large piles and in some cases are abandoned leading to nuisance and environmental concerns. Due to weight, shingle piles are very costly material to remediate.



This also points to a larger challenge – construction/demolition waste, in general. Some components of this waste stream (drywall, some wood, metals) are well managed – other aspects, such as shingles, still need attention.

## GLASS

Glass is increasingly being eliminated from single-stream recycling programs due to the added expense of glass contamination in other recyclables and the cost of equipment damage. Through the efforts of Ripple Glass, LLC (Kansas City), several regional “hubs” have been established throughout most of the state that collect and pool glass that Ripple transports at their expense with a 25-ton required minimum shipment. A few communities are experiencing difficulty in being able to construct and operate regional “bunkers” to pool nearby glass for transport to Ripple. There is little revenue for glass locally and transportation costs due to weight and distance are a deterrent to other glass recycling options.

With the current trend away from single-use plastic, glass is becoming an attractive alternative. It also remains the packaging of choice for many existing products; therefore, efforts to continue to facilitate and grow the regional services for glass recycling are seen as an important component in the successful management of this particular waste stream.

## LITHIUM ION BATTERIES

Lithium-ion batteries are rechargeable batteries and are used as a source of power in many types of home and commercial electronics such as cordless power tools, smartphones, hover boards, e-bicycles, laptops, tablets. Their share of the battery market is growing rapidly due to the increasing demand for portable consumer electronics. Their market share is also expected to continue to grow because of their potential use in the automotive sector (electric/hybrid vehicles).

Safety of lithium-based batteries, however, has attracted much attention over the past few years. They have caused fires in hover boards, laptops and phones.

As the use of these batteries grows, their presence in the waste stream is expected to grow. Their safety risk also extends to disposal. Because lithium-ion batteries retain some amount of charge when they are “dead,” they have been suspected of causing fires in the back of trash and recycling trucks, where the batteries can be damaged during transport and exposed to other chemicals. Known as “hot loads,” these incidences can jeopardize the health and safety of the driver and public, and can damage personal property and collection vehicles. They also pose a threat to a landfill, if undetected as they may start a trash fire as the batteries are compacted with heavy equipment into the waste mass.

SWAB recommends evaluating legislation to manage lithium-ion battery disposal.

## 3.0 PROPOSED RULES AND REGULATIONS

In January 2017, Executive Order 17-03, required Missouri agencies to conduct a review of all existing and proposed regulations. In July 2017, the No MO Red Tape initiative for Missourians to submit recommendations for action to cut government red tape was launched.



In this spirit of reducing red tape, the districts reviewed the rules and procedures that govern how a solid waste district receives and manages its portion of the Missouri Solid Waste Management Fund (aka, “The District Grant Rule”) and the General Terms and Conditions.

In reviewing the grant rule and terms and conditions, the districts attempted to ease the administrative burden on districts and to update outdated regulatory language. The amount of paper, forms, reports, and duplication can become both a distraction from focusing on our mission and a deterrent to potential grant applicants. Streamlining MDNR WMP and district requirements and policies has the potential to create efficiencies, improve accountability, increase partnership between districts and WMP, and create a more engaged workforce with more time to focus on the mission of WMP.

The revisions suggested by SWAB were provided as an attachment to the 2017 annual report. They were also submitted directly through the nomoredtape.com site established by the Governor. A copy is included as Attachment C. When first prepared, SWAB had been asked to review and make recommendations for streamlining existing regulations. Currently there is pending litigation regarding some of the topics included in Attachment C. SWAB has not and will not take a position on the pending litigation. Recommendations included in Attachment C, prepared in 2017, do not support any position in this litigation.

## 4.0 GRANT AWARD CRITERIA

### GRANT AWARD CRITERIA

The grant award criteria are established in state statute and include 19 criteria that districts must consider when awarding grants. Current criteria for awarding grants are established in 10 CSR 80-9.040(5)(C) and include the following core criteria:

1. Conformance with the integrated waste management hierarchy as described in the Missouri Policy on Resource Recovery, as incorporated by reference in this rule;
2. Conformance with the State Targeted Materials List;
3. Degree to which the project contributes to community based economic development;
4. Degree to which funding to the project will adversely affect existing entities in the market segment;
5. Degree to which the project promotes waste reduction or recycling through the proposed process;
6. Demonstration of cooperative efforts through a public/private partnership or among political subdivisions;
7. Compliance with federal, state or local requirements;
8. Transferability of results;
9. The statewide need for the information;
10. Technical ability of the applicant;
11. Managerial ability of the applicant;
12. Ability to implement in a timely manner;
13. Technical feasibility;
14. Availability of commitments necessary to conduct the project;
15. Level of commitment for financing;
16. Type of contribution by applicant;
17. Effectiveness and quality of marketing strategy;
18. Quality of budget; and
19. Selected financial ratios.



SWAB has reviewed the criteria and makes the following suggestions:

- Rewriting criterion number 4 to make it easier to evaluate: Degree to which the project will result in improvement or expansion of services. Districts do not have the ability to forecast how the market segment of an existing entity will be impacted by a grant award.
- Eliminating criterion number 6. While partnerships can be beneficial, they are not always necessary for the success of a project. This criterion can be detrimental to the scoring single-entity projects.
- Eliminating criterion number 8. Missouri is a diverse state and not all projects will show potential for transferability to other regions. While transferability can be beneficial, it should not be necessary.
- Eliminating criterion number 9. When asked, most districts did not understand the criterion nor how it should be applied when evaluating grant applications.
- Combining criterion 10 with criterion 11, which eliminates the need for a separate evaluation of an applicant's technical and managerial abilities.
- Eliminating criterion 16. Not all districts require match funding from applicants.
- Eliminating criterion 17. Not all grants require a marketing strategy.
- Eliminating criterion 19. Districts are required to obtain bond ratings from cities and three years of financial reports from applicants seeking funding over \$50,000. This requirement is vague and provides no guidance as to its implementation.

In the event that it becomes possible to revise parts of the original SB 530, after having experience administering these grants for three decades, SWAB recommends a complete review and revision of the grant award criteria in order to make the criteria easier to understand and more applicable to the diverse grant applications the districts receive.

## RECYCLING PROGRAM BENEFITS

The sole reliance on tonnages diverted from landfilling when evaluating the success of waste reduction and recycling programs is no longer adequate. Other measurable impacts include participation rates, jobs created and jobs maintained, state and local tax revenues generated, landfill volume reductions, greenhouse gas reductions, resources conserved, etc. The number of tons diverted from disposal has been the only program measure for many years, and it has become insufficient as the only measure. There are numerous other ways to measure the benefits of recycling programs, and it is time to implement additional ways to measure program benefits. Following the recommendations of the Waste Diversion Metric Evaluation Sub-committee of SWAB, a contract is in place with SCS Engineering to analyze measures in other states and to develop recommendations for Missouri.

## 5.0 WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

The districts were each asked to select one or two waste management issues facing their district for inclusion in this report. The issues identified by the districts include:

- Right to Repair
- Market Development
- Product Stewardship
- Affordable recovery and recycling of illegally dumped scrap tires
- Closed landfills



## RIGHT TO REPAIR

It's inevitable. The things we own stop working or break. Getting broken items repaired is becoming more challenging as consumers rarely have the ability to repair their own items or have them repaired at an independent repair shop. While many manufacturers allow consumers and local repair shops to fix their products, there are others that are making it more difficult by not releasing repair manuals, using proprietary fasteners or not making parts available.

Making repairs difficult means that many consumers will choose to replace the item and send the broken item to the landfill. Right to Repair laws typically require manufacturers to publish repair manuals and sell the parts, diagnostic software, and tools needed to fix their products. The goal of these laws is to ensure consumers can repair their own items, or pay an independent repair shop to do so. Several states over the past year, Missouri included, introduced legislation that would require manufacturers of electronic equipment to sell repair parts and release service information to consumers.

SWAB is supportive of actions that improve access to repair to keep products in service and out of the waste stream.

## MARKET DEVELOPMENT

Creating new products from recovered materials provides a great economic development opportunity for Missouri. Aggressive efforts by Missouri in response to market challenges and opportunities would better position Missouri recyclers to weather future market fluctuations and create additional Missouri recycling jobs.

Regardless of market fluctuations, there is always an opportunity for Missouri to support alternative recycling markets. There is already a Market Development program in place, administered by the Environmental Improvement and Energy Resources Authority (EIERA). Unfortunately, the program is seriously underfunded, and receives only \$800,000.00 per year. This is not enough to make a big impact, and a significant increase in funding over several years would allow Missouri to be competitive in attracting end-users to our state. An aggressive business attraction effort would also be needed, which would be greatly enhanced by collaboration with the Department of Economic Development and other business expansion resources that Missouri has to offer. This is a great opportunity for those that can act swiftly and collaboratively.

## PRODUCT STEWARDSHIP

Product Stewardship and Extended Producer Responsibility are becoming the industry standard to implement best practices for managing hard to handle materials, both nationally and internationally. Product Stewardship is an environmental management strategy that means whoever designs, produces, sells, or uses a product, takes responsibility for minimizing the product's environmental impact throughout all stages of the products' life cycle, including end of life management. Currently local governments and taxpayers pay for the end-of-life management of these products through their recycling fees, disposal costs, and property taxes. Product Stewardship allows us to move from disposal efforts, such as recycling, to preemptive solutions, such as manufacturing design and techniques that can be much more effective. Product Stewardship also provides a long-term solution to manage waste products by shifting the responsibility for collection, transportation, and management of products away from local governments to the manufacturers who introduce those products into the marketplace. Solid waste district-funded programs began in 2018 to develop and apply the principles of Product Stewardship to Missouri's



waste stream. The current focus of the council is on paint and similar materials, pharmaceuticals and mattresses. This approach offers the best opportunity to expand progressive waste management programs in Missouri in the coming years.

### AFFORDABLE RECOVERY AND RECYCLING OF ILLEGALLY DUMPED SCRAP TIRES

The end of the Missouri Vocational Enterprises (MVE) recycling program and MDNR's Scrap Tire Roundup Program have had a very negative impact on many of the districts that used these programs. This leaves many municipalities and residents, particularly in rural areas, without an economically viable option to properly dispose of scrap tires. The state needs to continue to seek affordable, cost-effective, long-term solutions to provide cleanup assistance for illegally dumped scrap tires. The state should also take steps to further develop markets for scrap tires in order to promote the use of scrap tire materials and encourage recycling. The state generates over 5 million scrap tires a year. These scrap tires pose a number of risks including fire and the ability to harbor disease-carrying vectors.

### INADEQUATE RESOURCES TO ADDRESS CLOSED LANDFILLS WITH ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Currently, landfills permitted in Missouri are required to include closure and post-closure plans and provide financial assurance mechanisms to properly close the landfill and provide for post-closure maintenance and monitoring. However, many older landfills, which have been closed or abandoned for years and were permitted under earlier less protective regulations, do not have these mechanisms in place to mitigate risks to the public and the environment. It is likely, that each county in Missouri has a legacy of closed and abandoned landfill sites.

In recent years, there has been discussion about establishing a fund for MDNR to remediate hazards posed by these closed or abandoned landfills. SWAB will continue to be a part of any future discussions as to how this fund could be created; how a complete inventory of closed/abandoned disposal sites throughout Missouri can be created; and the role of various organizations in creating a fund, administering resources, and mitigating hazards. New state funding would be needed to address this issue. District funds are insufficient to address district priorities and should not be targeted for such a purpose.

## 6.0 NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND IMPROVED METHODS

New technologies and improved methods to use or recycle materials that would otherwise be waste must be part of a continued discussion in Missouri.

### LOCAL AND STATE POLICIES

Recycling and waste minimization have an inherent economic disadvantage to landfilling in Missouri, for an average resident it is simply easier and cheaper to dispose of items that could otherwise be diverted to a better use. Policies, fees, regulations, and incentives create a more level playing field for waste reduction, from product stewardship legislation to local governments including curbside recycling in their solid waste fee instead of offering it as a separate and optional service. Relying on people's good intentions, more convenient recycling, and new technology to increase waste diversion will only go so far. Monetary incentives and compliance assistance are



needed to change behavior, such as, pay as you throw programs and landfill bans for both residents and businesses for certain materials. We will continue to see a slow growth rate for waste diversion until state and local governments begin implementing legislation, policies, and programs that make waste diversion a priority.

## FOOD WASTE

The national movement to reduce food waste presents an opportunity for waste diversion and economic growth in Missouri. Missouri has institutions and businesses that produce large amounts of food waste and plenty of rural areas ideal for composting operations and opportunity for distributing products to farming operations. These factors, coupled with the growing popularity of local and organic produce create an untapped opportunity for Missouri.

The districts and MDNR should be working together to identify strategies for households, businesses, and government to reduce food waste and to provide recommendations for state and local government for setting targets for reduction, providing direction and infrastructure to enable food waste prevention programs, creating incentives for donation programs, and providing education about waste prevention. Since about 10-14% of material going into Missouri landfills is food waste, this is a great opportunity to increase state diversion rates while also ensuring that unused food is either routed to those who can use it, or disposed of in an environmentally responsible manner.

## ORGANIC WASTE

Organic waste, both food and yard waste, is one of the few recoverable materials that can be collected in our state, processed into a product in our state, and sold to customers in our state. It is important for Missouri to continue to develop and expand organics markets to allow organics processing to remain competitive with disposal.

The ban on landfilling of yard waste has made a significant contribution to helping the state achieve its waste diversion goals. The districts support continuation of this yard waste ban, effective since 1992, to divert yard waste materials from landfills and support the organics recycling industry to achieve greater diversion of these and other organic materials through recycling and composting.

## EXTENDED PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY/PRODUCT STEWARDSHIP

Product Stewardship is a practice wherein environmental, health, and safety protection centers on the product itself. Everyone involved in the lifespan of the product—manufacturers, retailers, users, and disposers—are responsible for its environmental, health, and safety impacts. For manufacturers, this includes planning for, and if necessary, paying for the recycling or disposal of the product at the end of its useful life. For retailers and consumers, this means taking an active role in ensuring the proper disposal or recycling a product at end of life. Product Stewardship provides an infrastructure for the disposal or recycling of the product.

Missouri has an opportunity to foster Product Stewardship, especially as it relates to waste management by undertaking cooperative efforts with manufacturers, retailers and others to increase recycling of discarded products such as electronics, mattresses, carpet, paint, pharmaceuticals, fluorescent lighting, and mercury thermostats. Missouri can learn from other states that have developed, or are developing take-back mandates for selected products leading to cost-effective approaches to handling problem products and wastes. This approach



will reduce the burden on Missouri taxpayers to manage these problem wastes at the expense of local governments by building a sustainable infrastructure to dispose of these items at the end of their usable life funded and managed by the manufacturers and retailers.

## 7.0 UNFUNDDED SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROJECTS

In FY2021, the districts funded 178 projects totaling \$5,800,947.32. The districts also leveraged \$1,044,083.03 in match and project funds. For the same time period, the districts report that 41 projects requesting \$2,984,205.04 were unfunded. Some of these projects were not funded because the districts determined that the grant applications were incomplete or the projects would not lead to significant diversion of recyclable materials. This year, the districts reported no projects were unfunded strictly due to insufficient resources available to the district. However, not all districts reported a reason for not funding some projects and many projects were partially funded as a means to stretch limited grant resources. Totals reflect data from 17 of the 20 districts.

A summary of district funded and unfunded projects is provided as Attachments A and B to this report.

## 8.0 OTHER MATTERS

### EDUCATION/AWARENESS PROGRAMS TO REDUCE CONTAMINATION IN RECYCLING

The closure of foreign markets for recovered materials has not only resulted in problems with markets for recyclable materials, it has highlighted the need to focus on “cleaning up” recycling programs. There have always been problems with contamination in recycling collection programs, but the poor quality of materials being shipped overseas is the reason why those markets have closed to U.S. shipments of recyclables. It has become very clear that domestic programs need to return to the basics on educating the public on what is a recoverable material and what is trash. SWAB strongly recommends that both the districts and MDNR put more emphasis on, and resources toward, providing public education and awareness programs to improve the quality of the recyclable commodities being collected. It is not enough to just encourage citizens to reduce, reuse and recycle – they must be educated on how to recover recyclables properly; what can and cannot be recycled; and why it is so important that contamination be avoided.

In 2019, MDNR allocated \$240,000 from the Waste Tire Education Fund for use to bolster recycling efforts and success across the state. The 90-day campaign encourage residents to recycle and to make a special effort to reduce contamination in the materials we recycle. The program was designed to complement existing or planned local/district educational efforts. No such program was available in 2021, though districts continue to promote proper recycling as much as possible.

### LOCAL CONTROL

Local support of recycling through regional solid waste management districts has been a key factor in the growth and success of recycling in Missouri. Maintaining and strengthening local control will ensure the best use of resources and the implementation of projects best suited for local needs in a highly diverse state like Missouri. Local control and development is especially important for sustaining recycling programs in the rural areas of the



state where economies of scale, transportation costs and smaller populations make recycling and waste reduction programs especially challenging. SWAB believes that many Missouri citizens wish to have the opportunity to recycle and additional efforts need to be made to find innovative ways to foster the growth of rural waste reduction, composting, and recycling programs.

## WASTE DIVERSION GOAL

In 1990, Missouri established a 40 percent waste diversion goal. Recycling has become a significant statewide industry that has created thousands of jobs, in addition to improving communities and protecting our environment. Increasing our diversion goal to 75 percent will generate additional economic growth and improve communities across Missouri. Missouri has about 25,000 recycling jobs, and increased recycling can create thousands of additional jobs.

Actions to move Missouri towards the 75 percent diversion goal include:

- Education and outreach that focuses on the opportunity that increased waste diversion brings to Missouri. Efforts should target solid waste districts, municipal decision makers, legislators, businesses and the public.
- Emphasis on specific items in the waste stream that can provide the greatest impact. Five large-volume commodities have been identified that, when diverted, will add considerable additional tonnage toward the goal of 75 percent. Extensive research has been completed by the Missouri Recycling Association to identify current infrastructure and potential strategies for diversion of each of five commodities that include e-scrap, construction and demolition waste, paint, textiles, and organics. Education and outreach will focus on the opportunities that increasing waste diversion brings to Missouri and by working with stakeholder groups, we can collectively determine the best strategies for each of the targeted commodities. These strategies include producer responsibility programs, growing end markets, education and outreach, and promoting participation in other state and national programs. A common element for each commodity will be action steps that both businesses and individuals can take to reduce, reuse and minimize the need to landfill each target commodity. This component is especially important in rural regions where recycling options are limited or non-existent.

## WASTE DIVERSION MEASUREMENT

In 1990, Missouri adopted a statewide waste diversion goal of 40% by 1998. According to measurements by MDNR, the state achieved 40% diversion in 2001. MDNR measures diversion through a calculation of the amount of waste that would be expected to be placed in final disposal (i.e., generated) compared to the amount actually placed in final disposal.

For the disposal estimate, MDNR tracks the amount of waste disposed in Missouri landfills, waste transported out of state for disposal, and estimates the amount of waste imported into the state for disposal.

The most challenging aspect of determining waste diversion estimates continues to be the accurate assessment of the amount of waste generated. MDNR has used two methods to estimate the amount of waste generated:

- From 1990 to 1999, MDNR used a fixed generation rate of 1.47 tons/person multiplied by annual population estimates to determine waste generation. Using this methodology, the state calculated the diversion rate to be 24% in 1999.



- In 1999, MDNR switched to a variable generation rate that reflects the state of the economy. The variable generation rate uses Personal Consumption Expenditures (PCE) in which waste generated in 1990 was divided by PCE for 1990 to derive an index by which subsequent years' PCE values may be multiplied. The 1999 diversion rate was recalculated by MDNR to be 36% in 1999 using the variable generation rate. The 2017 diversion rate has been calculated to be approximately 63%.

SWAB believes that the current waste diversion rate methodology used by MDNR overestimates the state's diversion rate. SWAB encourages DNR to continue to evaluate waste diversion methodologies and recommends implementing any possible improvements to the diversion methodology as appropriate to improve the accuracy of the diversion calculations. It is also time to implement additional program evaluation tools, including measures such as economic impacts, conservation and energy saving impacts, and greenhouse gas reductions. Tons of waste diverted as the only program measure is no longer adequate to communicate the benefits of waste reduction and recycling programs in Missouri. Following the recommendations of the Waste Diversion Metric Evaluation Subcommittee of SWAB, a contract is in place with SCS Engineering to analyze measures in other states and to develop recommendations for Missouri.

#### MAINTAIN THE BAN ON YARD WASTE IN LANDFILLS

Composting has tremendous environmental benefits, and also has created thousands of Missouri jobs. Organic materials in Missouri landfills emit tons of methane gas every year, and composting greatly reduces this huge pollution source. Allowing yard waste back into landfills would have tremendous negative impacts on the environment and economy in Missouri. Keeping other organic wastes out of the landfills would also create additional economic opportunities for Missouri, and further reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

#### COVID-19 PANDEMIC

The coronavirus outbreak in early 2020 had an impact on recycling in Missouri. Local recycling centers throughout the state experienced temporary closures. Most of them reopened by mid-to-late 2020 and many continue to take safety precautions, including mask requirements and social distancing, to protect customers and staff.

Staffing issues continue to impact the industry as well, as employees exposed to the virus must be quarantined for 14 days. Labor shortages have also caused recycling businesses to struggle.

Due to health and safety concerns, many districts have limited or cancelled collection events for a variety of materials, such as HHW and electronic waste.

The pandemic has caused a significant increase in single-use items, such as PPE and masks, and even take-out food containers, plastic cups, plastic-ware, and plastic bags. This increase creates challenges for the waste-stream, particularly because these items are difficult, or impossible, to recycle. The rise in online shopping has led to increased use of cardboard boxes and packaging, not all of which gets properly recycled. These and other factors related to the pandemic have contributed to excess waste and the current record tonnage amounts at landfills.

As the pandemic is ongoing, it is too soon to tell what long-term effects it will have on recycling in Missouri, though the resulting economic downturn may have a lasting effect on markets. All recycling and waste industry companies should be considered for any type of loan or assistance programs as they struggle with survival during the pandemic and recovery afterward.



## EMERGING ISSUE: LANDFILL CLOSURES / LANDFILL CAPACITY

Missouri's relatively low landfill tipping fees provide a disincentive for waste reduction and recycling efforts and this leads to higher trash disposal volumes, which in turn leads to full and closed landfills. Recent landfill record disposal volumes have altered the future of Missouri's landfill capacity. There are currently only seventeen active landfills in the state, with the permitting process to site, construct, and begin operation of a new landfill taking five years to complete. As these landfills age and close, it presents challenges to funding for district programs. It will also lead to increased costs for Missouri residents, as trash will be transported out of state for disposal, if new landfills in-state are not built or expanded to replace those that close. The capacity issue is currently being studied to determine what, if any, action should be taken to address potential impacts on waste diversion in the state.

## EMERGING ISSUE: PLASTIC BAGS AND STYROFOAM

There is growing concern regarding two materials, plastic bags and Styrofoam. There are currently few outlets collecting plastic bags for recycling, although they are used almost universally by retailers throughout the state. The inability to easily recycle them leads to increased amounts of plastic in landfills, in addition to litter in our environment.

Styrofoam presents a challenge in multiple ways. The pandemic has led to an increase in take-out food containers, which cannot be recycled and therefore must be landfilled. It has also resulted in more consumers shopping online, with an increased use of Styrofoam packaging. In the past, there have been a few options to recycle this material, but those opportunities continue to dwindle throughout the state, sending most of the Styrofoam to the landfills. Another concern for several districts is old dock foam. There is currently no outlet to recycle this material and it is increasingly becoming a problem in areas surrounding our lakes.

The Districts will continue to monitor these materials.



## ATTACHMENT A

## FY2021 DISTRICT FUNDED PROJECTS



## Funded Grant Projects – FY2021

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
A	NWMSU - Skid Steer Loader	\$19,500	\$19,500	\$30,400		\$49,900	Funds requested towards purchase of skid steer load to support the composting, food waste diversion and recycling activities at NW MO State University	
A	NWMORCOG - HHW Vendor Pick-up	\$19,500	\$19,500			\$19,500	Funds requested to hold 6 collections throughout the year for HHW Collections.	
A	City of Grant City - Multi-purpose Basketball Court	\$25,430	\$18,350	\$12,928		\$31,278	Funds requested for a multi-purpose basketball court using recycled materials for surface.	
A	Farmer's Exchange LLC - Recycling Bins	\$309	\$309	\$77		\$386	Funds request for purchase of 3 recycling bins for use at a mixed-use building in Mound City to divert glass, plastic and aluminum from the landfill with transfer of materials to recycling center.	
A	Plan Implementation	\$7,500	\$7,500			\$7,500	Funds requested to host individual city clean up events showcasing recycling opportunities with community specific education in ways to recycle with focus on reducing contamination of recycling materials into the waste stream.	
B	NMSWMD - Region B - PI	\$26,500	\$26,500	\$0	\$0	\$26,500	This grant funds the goals of the solid waste management plan including district collections	
B	Caldwell County	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$3,633	\$0	\$23,633	The project will continue the recycling efforts of the county, moving the trailer to different cities that don't have access to recycling. The grant also will purchase a new recycling trailer.	
C	No information submitted for this report.							
D	Andrew County	\$21,944	\$21,944	\$0		\$21,944	Funding for 2 part-time employees (total 40 hrs per week)	
D	City of Clarksdale	\$42,848	\$20,587	\$22,262		\$42,848	Purchase tractor and attachments to construct a walking trail utilizing recycled materials	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
D	Clinco Industries	\$41,746	\$41,746	\$4,638		\$46,384	Funding salaries for 2 supervisors and rollaway carts for sorting recyclables	
D	Region D Recycling & Waste Management District - Recycling Project support	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$0		\$3,000	This project will support recycling programs with supplies or upkeep as needed. Replacement for tires, tarps, need for bins, etc are minimal assistance and often fall in between grant calls, so this project will assist in the needs.	
D	Region D Recycling & Waste Management District - Education	\$9,875	\$9,875	\$0		\$9,875	The grant was originally to pay a contractor to go in the schools, with the COVID restrictions, the grant was modified to purchase professionally developed videos (3) for digital delivery	Original funding amount was increased due to the change of scope of work.
D	Region D Recycling & Waste Management District - HHW & Electronics Collection & Storage Container Support	\$43,720	\$43,720	\$0		\$43,720	The project supports 2 HHW collection and storage containers. Support is host fee, supplies and recycling/disposal. The project also supports host fees and recycling fees for electronics at 2 locations.	
D	City of Stewartsville	\$3,895	\$3,894	\$0		\$3,895	Project will pay salary for managing the recycling center including clean up and delivery of recyclables for processing. Also a load of gravel and mileage to the processor	
E	Product Stewardship Institute (PSI)	\$49,992	\$49,992	\$26,100		\$76,092	PSI will work with district staff and the MO Product Stewardship Council on paint and pharmaceutical waste diversion.	
E	R. Alexander Associates	\$39,485	\$39,485	\$4,400		\$43,885	R. Alexander Associates will provide technical assistance to encourage use of compost for engineering and landscape work.	
E	KC Can Compost	\$99,383	\$89,192	\$9,910		\$99,102	KC Can Compost will hire a manager to facilitate the organization's growing business. Funds also support the purchase of a satellite unit to accommodate food waste collection.	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
E	Sleepyhead Beds	\$31,500	\$31,500	\$3,500		\$35,000	Sleepyhead Beds will hire a community manager with the goal of establishing partnerships with local governments and retailers for the collection of mattresses for reuse.	
E	Missouri Recycling Association (MORA)	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$6,000		\$66,000	Funds will support the executive director of MORA, the state-wide recycling non-profit. This is an exceptional request resulting from the cancellation of the organization's conference due to COVID-19.	
E	City of Kansas City, MO	\$44,000	\$44,000	\$5,854		\$49,854	Kansas City will consult with a professional to train city staff on green procurement.	
E	Kansas City Art Institute (KCAI)	\$40,000	\$34,600	\$3,886		\$38,486	KCAI will hire a coordinator to implement reuse, recycling and composting projects campus wide.	
E	Bridging The Gap (BTG)	\$87,070	\$73,019	\$8,114		\$81,133	BTG will provide consulting services to at least 15 businesses for the start up of recycling and composting programs.	
E	Midwest Recycling Center (MRC)	\$30,622	\$30,622	\$3,403		\$34,025	MRC will purchase a forklift to add efficiencies to their electronic recycling operations.	
E	MARC	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$4,500		\$49,500	Upgrade Recyclespot.org, using a new content management system that would make the site more mobile phone friendly.	
E	Product Stewardship Institute	\$26,377	\$26,377	\$2,638		\$29,015	PSI will conduct recycled paint demonstrations, recycled paint procurement education, and coalition building to increase awareness of and demand for recycled paint.	
E	Rick Caplan	\$15,120	\$15,120	\$1,512		\$16,632	Funding to support the costs associated with teaching high school students financial and environmental literacy in school with a focus on waste reduction, reuse, and recycling.	
E	Rick Caplan	\$9,300	\$9,300	\$930		\$10,230	Facilitating an environmental news program with a focus on solid waste with Cristo Rey High School students.	
E	Ripple Glass	\$108,250	\$108,250	\$10,825		\$119,075	Purchase ten containers for glass collection.	
E	Urban Lumber Company	\$21,325	\$21,325	\$2,133		\$23,458	Purchase a new kiln body for a kiln Urban Lumber currently owns to expand processing of urban logs.	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
E	MARC SWMD Outreach	\$230,426	\$230,426	\$0		\$230,426	For district outreach activities	
E	MARC SWMD Planning	\$75,411	\$75,411	\$0		\$75,411	For district solid waste planning and sponsorship program	
E	MARC SWMD HHW	\$103,580	\$103,580	\$0		\$103,580	For regional HHW program	
F	No information submitted for this report.							
G	Macon County Sheltered Workshop	\$39,690	\$39,690	\$4,410		\$44,100	Funding was used to purchase a new baler and forklift to aid in the recycling of cardboard and other recyclables.	
G	Pike County Sheltered Workshop	\$6,750	\$6,750	\$750		\$7,500	Funding was used to help the small cities within Pike County continue recycling. Due to COVID and budget restrictions the cities were going to stop their recycling contract with The Pike County Sheltered Workshop. The funding used by the workshop covered the cost associated with taking and collecting their recycling trailer from each location.	
G	Monroe City Sheltered Workshop	\$73,521	\$73,521	\$8,169		\$81,690	Funding was used to purchase a new horizontal baler to help keep up with the baling of plastics and metals at the workshop.	
G	Monroe City Sheltered Workshop	\$23,580	\$23,580	\$2,620		\$26,200	Funding was used to purchase a densifier baler to aid in aluminum recycling at the workshop.	
H	Midwest Recycling Center	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$3,500		\$13,500	MRC is requesting funds to replace an aging used forklift from a previous MMSWMD Grant with a used forklift for their Jefferson City location.	
H	Boonslick Industries	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$8,775		\$18,775	Boonslick Industries is requesting funds to update and improve their current OCC delivery method from their outdoor containment area to the processing floor. Removing an in-ground hopper and conveyor, a new ramp into the building, and removing and replacing an overhead door.	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
H	City of Ashland	\$3,535	\$3,535	\$2,313		\$5,848	The City of Ashland has recently completed a new Recycling Center for their community and is requesting funds for additional lighting to allow for safe use for residents during evening hours. Ashland Public works will provide labor costs and the ongoing maintenance will be part of city-owned infrastructure plans.	
H	City of Vandalia	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$8,690		\$18,690	The City of Vandalia is requesting funds to purchase playground equipment made from recycled material for their Daniels Park location. This park not only used by residents of the city, but also by numerous local schools, daycares and out of town visitors. As part of the match for this project, stickers and bags will be provided to the community in order to promote the curbside recycling pickup provided by the Dayne's Waste Disposal as part of the City contract.	
H	Columbia STEM Alliance	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,900		\$20,900	The Columbia STEM Alliance is requesting funds to launch a series of Science Technology Engineering Arts and Math contests. This is a hands-on program where students help solve a problem. A different environmental theme will be featured in each contest. Grant funds will be used to pay for labor and materials.	
H	Information Management and Securities, LLC.	\$10,839	\$10,839	\$3,613		\$14,452	IMS, LLC is requesting funds to install a steel plate floor and new lift gate in their 2010 International Box truck. This would allow pallets to be loaded via forklift instead of other slower methods which require increase labor time. This also allows for documents to be loaded at facilities without a loading dock or shipping bay.	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
I	Boonslick Regional Planning Commission	\$75,135	\$75,135		\$42,264	\$117,399	In April 2010, the Region I SWMD established the East Central Missouri Recycling Center. This was a collaborative effort of the four counties in Region I to provide an opportunity to recycle for all residents of the district. Grant funds awarded to this project are used for continued operational expenses of the recycling center. The facility is open year-round and accepts a variety of items, some of which are not typically included in most curbside recycling programs.	
J	El Dorado Springs R-2 School District	\$24,999	\$22,000	\$0	\$0	\$22,000	To replace old playground equip with new equip made from recycled material.	
J	Meredith Used Car Sales & Recycling, LLC	\$30,682	\$26,077	\$4,605	\$0	\$30,682	Six roll-off containers for ferrous metal.	
J	MORA	\$9,992	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	Sheltered workshop conference attendee fees	
J	Osceola FFA	\$8,100	\$8,100	\$0	\$0	\$8,100	Collection of paper, cardboard and plastics from public & schools	
J	City of Windsor	\$12,106	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	Supplying recycling bins to residents for collection of plastics, newspapers, cardboard, office paper & metals (steel, tin, aluminum food/bev cans).	
K	Meramec Regional Planning Commission	\$36,912	\$33,912			\$33,912	Funding for a district-wide project supporting prevention, identification and clean-up of illegal dumps along with funding transport of illegally dumped tires collected along county roadways. School fieldtrip transportation is also provided for waste reduction related activities.	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
K	Meramec Regional Planning Commission		\$36,493			\$36,493	Funding for district-wide environmental education aligned with set target priorities such as food waste reduction and composting. Provides for the implementation of composting curriculum for schools with coaching for student led projects to further raise awareness of the district's goals for food waste reduction and composting. This projects also supports community and school recycling projects such as promoting event recycling.	
K	Dixon High School Key Club		\$4,375			\$4,375	Funding for the Dixon School district's student-led recycling program collecting materials from three schools and local businesses along with food waste composting and student activities for repurposing items from the local thrift shop.	
K	Curators - Missouri S&T Rolla	\$49,349	\$47,349			\$47,349	Funding for MO S&T's pilot construction project of an anaerobic digester addressing cafeteria food waste reduction. The digester's byproduct, biofuel, may be used for fueling kitchen stoves.	
K	Dixon Area Caring Center - Recycling Center		\$21,484			\$21,484	Funding for annually diverting 50 tons of thrift shop textiles along with materials collected via their 24/7 drop-off recycling center.	
K	City of St. James		\$11,765			\$11,765	Funding for recycling bins and campaign materials to increase curbside participation by 25%.	
L	City of University City	\$49,835	\$45,000	\$7,499	\$0	\$52,499	Recycling Carts & Education	
L	Jefferson County Solid Waste Division	\$145,394	\$125,000	\$76,059	\$0	\$201,059	Jefferson County Recycles 2.0	
L	St. Louis Earth Day dba earthday 365	\$72,511	\$60,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$70,000	Green Dining Alliance	
L	St. Charles County Public Health	\$81,000	\$73,000	\$8,146	\$0	\$81,147	2021 St. Charles County Recycling Center Program	
L	Missouri Botanical Garden - EarthWays Center	\$71,241	\$60,346	\$13,600	\$0	\$73,946	Recycling Education: Cutting Contamination Through Education	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	St. Louis Earth Day dba earthday 365	\$125,779	\$85,000	\$9,890	\$0	\$94,890	Recycling on the Go	
L	St. Louis County Department of Public Health	\$200,000	\$125,000	\$15,000	\$0	\$140,000	St. Louis HHW Collection	
L	City of Byrnes Mill	\$110,940	\$90,000	\$9,465	\$0	\$99,465	Byrnes Mill Recycling Center	
L	Habitat for Humanity of St. Charles County Restore	\$45,444	\$38,000	\$4,493	\$0	\$42,493	Habitat for Humanity St. Charles ReStore	
L	City of St. Charles	\$26,454	\$20,000	\$2,224	\$0	\$22,224	Shredding Recycling Events	
L	Perennial	\$35,400	\$30,000	\$3,750	\$0	\$33,750	Perennial's Creative Reuse Programs	
L	Leftovers, Etc. (Resource Recovery Project, Inc.)	\$59,000	\$32,500	\$4,875	\$0	\$37,375	Leftovers, etc. Resource & Learning Center	
L	MRC1 LLC (DBA MRC Recycling)	\$97,785	\$55,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$65,000	Equipment Procurement	
L	Operation Food Search	\$17,000	\$10,000	\$1,999	\$0	\$11,999	OFS Gleaning & Local Farming Partnership	
L	MoGreenFuture	\$26,743	\$12,000	\$2,500	\$0	\$14,500	Waste Reduction Education Platform, Part 2	
L	Brightside St. Louis	\$235,970	\$125,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$150,000	Recycle Responsibly (Regional Partners)	
L	Always Green Recycling, Inc.	\$57,500	\$30,000	\$6,300	\$0	\$36,300	Always Green Recycling 2021 Project	
L	St. Louis Earth Day dba earthday 365	\$104,326	\$80,000	\$15,388	\$0	\$95,388	Food Waste Regional Messaging Campaign	
L	Spectrum Ecycle Solutions, Inc.	\$22,320	\$15,000	\$2,000	\$0	\$17,000	Residential CRT & TV Recycling	
L	Jeffco Subcontracting Inc. (JSI)	\$34,821	\$25,000	\$10,949	\$0	\$35,949	Cardboard Recycling	
L	Missouri Recycling Association (MORA)	\$92,652	\$70,000	\$8,316	\$0	\$78,316	MORA Administrative Assistance and Conference	
L	Brightside St. Louis	\$66,866	\$50,000	\$6,735	\$0	\$56,735	SHARE 4.0	
L	Didion Orf Recycling	\$38,000	\$30,000	\$3,500	\$0	\$33,500	2021 DORI Electronics Warehouse	
L	St. Louis Health Equipment Lending Program, Inc. (STL HELP)	\$69,585	\$50,000	\$15,700	\$0	\$65,700	HELP "Three of a Kind" Recycling Centers Expansion	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	Waste Connections of Missouri, Inc.	\$44,995	\$20,000	\$2,482	\$0	\$22,482	Community Glass Recycling Project	
L	Missouri Kids Unplugged	\$34,500	\$15,000	\$3,000	\$0	\$18,000	MKU Recycling Road Show	
L	N.B. West Contracting Company	\$93,675	\$75,000	\$23,254	\$0	\$98,254	Ground Tire Rubber & Plastics Feeder Machine for Asphalt Plant	
L	Bicycle Works of St. Louis (DBA Bworks)	\$30,500	\$23,000	\$9,850	\$0	\$32,850	Community Bicycle Recycle Effort	
L	Proud Veteran Resources Recycling, LLC	\$49,999	\$40,000	\$6,000	\$0	\$46,000	Recycled Plastic Lumber Manufacturing	
L	City of Breckenridge Hills	\$42,200	\$20,000	\$4,454	\$0	\$24,454	Electronic Recycling Pickup Program	
L	Total Organics Recycling, Inc.	\$50,000	\$25,000	\$2,750	\$0	\$27,750	Compost Expansion	
L	Midwest Material Recovery	\$28,922	\$20,000	\$2,721	\$0	\$22,721	Electronics Recycling 2021	
L	Lens Masters, Inc.	\$39,116	\$10,000	\$1,121	\$0	\$11,121	St. Louis Consolidation Center	
L	St. Louis Composting, Inc.	\$86,100	\$40,000	\$9,600	\$0	\$49,600	Organics Recycling Processing Improvements	
L	City of St. Peters - Health & Environmental Services	\$45,000	\$40,000	\$200,000	\$0	\$240,000	Purchase of Eddy Current for Municipal Solid Waste Sort Line	
L	Home Sweet Home	\$50,260	\$45,000	\$16,468	\$0	\$61,468	Furnish Hope	
L	Adonis Holdings LLC	\$45,000	\$25,000	\$3,750	\$0	\$28,750	Forklift/Forklift Driver Wages	
L	Flooring Systems Inc.	\$45,000	\$20,000	\$2,250	\$0	\$22,250	Recycling Program 2021	
L	City of Bridgeton	\$58,363	\$15,000	\$2,602	\$0	\$17,602	Parks Recycle Program Phase II	
L	St. Louis Zoo	\$20,225	\$15,000	\$8,910	\$0	\$23,910	Single-Use Plastic Reduction	
L	Hansen's Tree, Lawn and Landscaping Services, Inc.	\$83,000	\$40,000	\$4,884	\$0	\$44,884	Belt Trailer to Haul Mulch & Compost	
L	INC Environmental Recycling	\$250,000	\$25,000	\$5,000	\$0	\$30,000	High lift	
L	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council	\$22,587	\$15,000	\$1,519	\$0	\$16,519	Food Waste Diversion Research 2021	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	Jack Kaufmann	\$15,000	\$5,000	\$750	\$0	\$5,750	In-The-Green Productions - Presents Jack Kaufmann	
L	St. Louis Teachers' Recycle Center	\$63,164	\$40,000	\$4,480	\$0	\$44,480	ReNew, ReConnect, ReUse	
L	Hubbard Radio St. Louis LLC	\$48,676	\$20,000	\$4,750	\$0	\$24,750	STL Recycles - 2021 Campaign	
L	St. Patrick Center	\$35,000	\$25,000	\$2,870	\$0	\$27,870	"Go Green" Waste Reduction & Recycling Program	
L	Fick Supply Service Inc.	\$42,286	\$10,000	\$60,286	\$0	\$70,286	Upgrades to Composting Operations	
L	East Loop Community Improvement District	\$47,200	\$40,000	\$13,742	\$0	\$53,742	Delmar Loop Waste Management	
L	Perennial City, LLC	\$156,600	\$40,000	\$11,235	\$0	\$51,235	Food Scraps to Farms	
L	Pro Computers & Consulting	\$49,000	\$15,000	\$4,050	\$0	\$19,050	Workforce 2021	
L	St. Anthony of Padua Food Pantry	\$25,883	\$10,000	\$2,290	\$0	\$12,290	Pantry Sustainability Project	
L	L.E.D.R. LLC	\$215,000	\$80,000	\$10,187	\$0	\$90,187	Wheel Loader	
M	District Operations	\$73,500	\$73,500	\$0	\$0	\$73,500	Staff, office rental, and operation costs	
M	Plan Implementation	\$69,000	\$69,000	\$0	\$0	\$69,000	Collection events, marketing, and education	
M	Vernon County	\$71,619	\$60,000	\$0	\$0	\$60,000	Staff for recycling center	
M	Seneca	\$7,410	\$7,410	\$0	\$0	\$7,410	Staff for pte at recycling center	
M	Joplin	\$64,591	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$50,000	Staff for recycling center	
M	Sheldon	\$3,073	\$3,073	\$0	\$0	\$3,073	Staff for recycling collection	
M	Carthage	\$35,110	\$27,529	\$0	\$0	\$27,529	Staff for recycling center	
M	Neosho	\$70,601	\$62,401	\$0	\$0	\$62,401	Staff and e-waste vendor for recycling center	
M	Granby	\$70,890	\$60,000	\$0	\$0	\$60,000	Staff and other operation costs for recycling center	
M	Newton County	\$32,836	\$31,836	\$0	\$0	\$31,836	Staff for recycling collection	
M	McDonald County	\$70,870	\$60,616	\$0	\$0	\$60,616	Staff and other operation costs for recycling collection	
M	Jasper County	\$26,775	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$20,000	Staff for recycling collection	
M	Joplin Habitat	\$27,500	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	Forklift for reuse program at ReStore	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
M	Lamar Enterprises	\$76,114	\$55,819	\$0	\$0	\$55,819	Staff and other operation costs for recycling program	
M	MORA	\$44,033	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$20,000	Sponsorship of annual conference	
M	Webb City	\$19,500	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	HHW vendor for community collection event	
M	Quality Products	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	Shredders for document destruction	
M	Service Recycling	\$58,181	\$29,000	\$0	\$0	\$29,000	Facility improvements and main recycling facility	
N	District N Education Programs & MORA Sponsorship	\$3,575	\$3,575			\$3,575	The District requested funds to cover the costs for their educational program. The District has limited funds to be able to reach out to a lot of the schools and organizations within the District. With this grant, representatives/educational speakers can visit with more individuals and explain the basics of recycling. This grant will enable representatives to visit schools or any organization that would like to have a recycling presentation within the five counties of the District. These funds will enable the District to be a Bronze sponsor for the 2020 MORA conference, and allow the District to help support the conference. The 2020 Conference was canceled due to COVID, but these funds will be to help sponsor the 2021 conference be held in Branson, which is located within Taney county.	
N	County of Stone	\$957	\$957			\$957	This funded registration and lodging fees and membership dues for one District N board member from Stone County to attend the MORA conference. This will allow the board member to attend educational sessions to learn more about recycling and to network with fellow peers in the recycling business.	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
N	City of Crane	\$5,871	\$2,871			\$2,871	The City of Crane used grant funds to host a E-Recycling (electronic recycling) event at their community recycling center. Funding for this event allowed them to supplement the cost of recycling outdated and non-working electronics which would ordinarily be improperly disposed of by local residents. These funds helped to conserve the City's already limited resources. The event was very successful and attendance was high. The City had originally asked for \$3,000 to also hold a tire drive during this electronic events; however, due to limited funds by District N, and DNR stating that funds could not be used for a free drive; \$3,000 of this grant was unfunded.	
N	City of Pierce City	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$294		\$3,294	The City of Pierce City requested funds to purchase a Tommy Lift to help them load their glass recycling bins onto their truck to transport to the City of Monett for recycling. For the past 10 years, many Pierce City and area citizens have been supporting their recycling projects with enthusiasm! The program has grown consistently. The glass recycling program began in 2011, their patrons responded readily. Some months, they have hauled two pickup loads to the recycling center in Monett. They have sponsored city, community, and school-wide education programs that involved early elementary through high school ages. They have recycling bins at the schools, others at the local convenience store and bins are provided for use the city's Spring and Fall Festivals. During the past year, they have recycled 6.5 tons of glass. They have also collected 15.2 tons of paper, in addition to tin (steel), aluminum and plastics #1-7. The glass bins once full are very heavy and difficult to load.	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
N	Hollister Schools	\$4,289	\$4,289			\$4,289	The Hollister School District requesting funding to expand its recycling program within the district. They are the leading recycling school in Taney county and believe that they have an obligation to their students, patrons, and the environment to make the best use possible of their financial and natural resources. They have recently leased a recycling trailer from District N. This grant would fund a concrete pad for the recycling trailer at the high school, so it can be placed in a position for easy access and for hooking up to a truck to take it to the Branson Recycle Center for processing. They requested funding for 34 - 14 blue gallon recycling tubs for each classroom and office area. They requested funds to purchase 6 - 64 gallon wheeled carts for the kitchen for their tin food cans. The Assistant Superintendent, Dr. Sean Woods, has a background in construction, which allows them to do small projects in house, such as the concrete pad for the recycling trailer.	
N	City of Branson	\$17,120	\$17,120			\$17,120	This grant funded the purchase of a recycling trailer to enable the City of Branson to be able to collect recyclables 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. With the growing demand for the convenience of 24/7 recycling, approximately 68% of their recyclable material is coming from their current self-service trailers. The trailers are full daily, frequently overflowing therefore, creating the need for larger capacity trailers like this one are needed. (Grant was forfeited due to the closure of the City of Branson Recycling Center - funds are carried over into the next grant cycle for city/county grants.)	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
N	All Points Recycling	\$19,950	\$19,950			\$19,950	All Points Recycling request funds for a functional semi-tractor, they would be able to pick up more recyclables in a timelier manner and they would have more reliable and safer tractor on the road. This is a district-wide project due to the fact that they pick up recycled materials from all across District N and beyond. They need this tractor so that their recycling facility can continue to grow and be successful. They have moved hundreds of loads of recycling material over the past 12 months, and they need a more reliable tractor to work with. They processed over 3.5 million pounds of material in 2018. That is all recycled product that they are keeping from the landfills. With the markets in such bad shape, funds are limited and they are concerned that if their tractor fails they would no longer be able to pick-up materials and as a result would no longer be able to survive.	
O	District PI: HHW	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$25,000	District PI grant to cover fees for proper disposal of HHW for all district residents at the City of Springfield's Household Chemical Collection Center.	
O	BedHead Mattress Recycling	\$43,200	\$30,240	\$0	\$0	\$30,240	This project will continue to expand the market for mattress recycling and work toward building a market for carpet recycling. Funds will be used for equipment and materials used in the recycling process.	
O	Big Brothers Big Sisters	\$45,908	\$32,136	\$0	\$0	\$32,136	This project will offer expansion of textile recycling within the district and meets needs in outlying areas that have had limited access to textile recycling. Funds will be used for additional collection bins, textile carts, and a box truck.	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
O	Christian County	\$26,570	\$26,570	\$0	\$0	\$26,570	This project will assist with recycling efforts for various communities throughout Christian County. Funds will be used to purchase a replacement recycling pickup truck.	
O	Community Outreach Ministries	\$39,600	\$27,720	\$0	\$0	\$27,720	This project will expand recycling in Polk County while also preserving food longer so it can be distributed at a local food pantry. Funds will be used for upright freezers and recycling drop off containers.	
O	Community Partnership of the Ozarks	\$20,000	\$14,000	\$0	\$0	\$14,000	This project expands efforts to divert e-waste through neighborhood cleanup events, especially in low income areas. Funds will be used to pay for expenses of picking items up and to cover disposal fees.	
O	Curators of MU/Missouri S&T	\$47,576	\$12,030	\$0	\$0	\$12,030	This project focuses on research to develop concrete pavement from recycled plastic. Funds will be used for research personnel and supplies.	
O	Downtown Springfield Association	\$43,430	\$30,401	\$0	\$0	\$30,401	This project maintains a glass recycling program with various businesses in and around Downtown Springfield. Funds will be used for personnel and recycling container expansion.	
O	Fair Grove High School	\$5,891	\$5,891	\$0	\$0	\$5,891	This project addresses diversion for local residents and meets a need for teaching residents about waste reduction practices. Funds will be used to purchase reusable totes made from plastic bottles and install filtered bottle filling stations throughout the schools to promote the reuse of water bottles.	
O	Missouri State University	\$5,574	\$5,574	\$0	\$0	\$5,574	This project expands upon the university's current recycling efforts. The university needs a larger recycling capacity, especially for events. Funds will be used for containers, lids, signage, and container transport.	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
O	Ozarks Food Harvest	\$2,047	\$2,047	\$0	\$0	\$2,047	This project provides education to potentially hundreds of volunteers and other visitors about food waste awareness and composting. Funds will be used to construct three composting bays as well as for signage, tools, and home composting supplies.	
O	Pleasant Hope R-VI School District	\$3,014	\$3,014	\$0	\$0	\$3,014	This grant expands the recycling and food waste programs previously supported by the district. It maintains recycling access in a 25-mile radius for residents, by opening the school recycling program to the local community. The food waste project will reduce waste within the district, while teaching students how to reduce waste. Funds will be used for containers, base rocks, a cardboard shredder, and signage.	
O	Polk County	\$29,000	\$14,500	\$0	\$0	\$14,500	This project maintains access to recycling in a 25-mile radius for residents. Funds will be used to purchase new dump trailers that will reduce number of trips to recycling facilities and increase staff efficiency in unloading trailers.	
O	Salvation Army	\$48,000	\$36,000	\$0	\$0	\$36,000	This project would allow for continuation of their current textile recycling program and the ability to increase diversion. Funds will be used to a second box truck to double the efforts in picking up targeted materials to divert from going to the landfill.	
O	Service Recycling	\$23,595	\$16,517	\$0	\$0	\$16,517	This project addresses the need for pallet recycling in the area. Unusable pallets will be disassembled and pieces used to repair other used pallets. Funds will be used to purchase a band saw with conveyor, a trim saw, and freight.	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
O	Springfield Community Gardens	\$8,559	\$8,559	\$0	\$0	\$8,559	This project is aimed at reducing food waste in local restaurants by educating kitchen staff and implementing better practices. Funds will be used to conduct workshops to educate those who work in restaurants about waste reduction through prevention, recovery, and recycling.	
O	Springfield Compost Collective	\$42,032	\$29,422	\$0	\$0	\$29,422	This project focuses on providing composting services to residents who currently have limited access. Funds will be used for hauling and storage equipment, education programs, and marketing.	
O	The King's Food Pantry	\$4,540	\$4,540	\$0	\$0	\$4,540	This project supports improved food waste diversion in Webster County by making more food available to those in need. Funds will be used for freezers, refrigerators, and a cardboard trailer.	
O	Trailspring	\$34,075	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	This project provides access to recycling at 2 local bike trails, one of which covers area in southern Christian County that is not close to a local recycling center. Funding will be used to purchase a truck and recycling containers.	
P	Mountain View Recycling	\$28,363	\$28,363			\$28,363	Grant funds are to provide wages for two part-time employees at the Mountain View Recycling Center. Additional funds are for ten new dumpsters for the Mountain View cardboard recycling program. Funding allows the city to continue providing recycling services to businesses and residents through the continuing operation of cardboard collections and the recycling center. The center serves citizens of Mountain View and the surrounding area, including Shannon County.	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
P	Ozark County Recycling Program	\$29,998	\$29,998			\$29,998	This project allows Ozark County to continue to provide a facility for the processing of recycled materials to Ozark County and surrounding areas. Grant funds are to pay wages for two employees at the Ozark County Recycling facility.	
P	Illegal Dump Cleanup	\$40,000	\$40,000			\$40,000	Funds will be used to hire a part-time project manager to identify illegal dump sites throughout the District and to clean up dump sites by organizing volunteers or hiring additional labor and renting equipment as needed.	
P	Shannon County Recycling Program	\$21,172	\$21,172			\$21,172	This project allows Shannon County to provide recycling services to residents and businesses. The grant pays partial wages for a county employee who serves as route driver collecting cardboard, paper, plastic, metal and aluminum cans. In addition to the partial wages for this employee, the grant covers fuel expenses for the route truck and maintenance on the truck and collections trailer.	
P	West Plains Household Hazardous Waste Collections	\$20,000	\$20,000			\$20,000	The SCSW District has established a Household Hazardous Waste Drop-off facility in West Plains, MO. This facility collects HHW from district residents on an ongoing basis. This grant funds the hazardous waste to be collected by a certified collector when the facility is at capacity, which is estimated to be roughly four times a year.	
P	Labor and Repairs Oregon County Recycling Center	\$29,424	\$29,424			\$29,424	These grant funds pay a portion of the cost of a worker at the recycling center for one year and help cover cost of much needed equipment maintenance and repair.	
P	E-Waste Collections	\$17,000	\$17,000			\$17,000	This grant funds contractual services with a certified electronic waste recycler to conduct three to five electronic waste (e-waste) collections across the District.	
P	Abandoned Tire Cleanup	\$20,500	\$20,500			\$20,500	This grant funds contracting with a certified tire recycling business to collect and recycle abandoned tires district-wide.	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
P	Lindsey's Recycling	\$28,339	\$28,339			\$28,339	This grant fund the collection and recycling of cardboard and mixed paper in Texas County.	
P	Leaf Vac-City of Thayer	\$11,892	\$11,892			\$11,892	These grant funds are used to purchase a leaf vacuum to replace an old one.	
P	Carbon Cycle Advanced Tire Pyrolysis	\$30,000	\$30,000			\$30,000	This project will use grant funding to add a second chamber to the current tire pyrolysis conversion system. Activities will include design, fabrication, and testing of the new configuration. The expansion of the current tire pyrolysis conversion system will allow for expanded capacity to divert scrap vehicle tires into recyclable steel, oil and char while ridding the environment of the excessive scrap tire problem.	
P	District Operations	\$83,689	\$83,689			\$83,689	This grant is for District Operations.	
P	Plan Implementation	\$32,503	\$32,503			\$32,503	This grant is for Plan Implementation.	
Q	Ozark Foothills Regional Planning Commission	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$60,000		\$150,000	The Ozark Foothills Resource Recovery project will operate the region's only Recycling Center, the Ozark Foothills Recycle Center. The Center serves a five-county region of Butler, Carter, Ripley, Reynolds, and Wayne.	
R	R2021-002 City of Cape Girardeau	\$18,657	\$16,464	\$8,289		\$24,753	Purchase Yard Containers to move recycling material from collection area to transfer station/recycling center	
R	R2021-003 Holcim	\$31,000	\$25,700	\$23,900				
R	R2021-004 St. Francois Co Gov't	\$9,064	\$9,064	\$9,064		\$18,128	Illegally dumped Tire Clean up	
R	R2021-005 Bollinger CO Recycling	\$11,325	\$10,325	\$4,775	\$15,000	\$30,100	Baler Purchase and Continuing Operations	
R	R2021-006 Perry County Recycling	\$20,000	\$19,000	\$6,000		\$25,000	Recycling Roof Replacement	
R	R2021-007 St. Francois Co Environmental	\$8,060	\$7,059	\$2,687		\$10,747	Metal Storage and Transportation Project	
R	R2021-009 Ste. Genevieve Co Recycling	\$13,353	\$12,352	\$4,444		\$17,777	Ste. Genevieve Recycling Center Baler Repairs	

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
S	Region S Plan Implementation	\$33,703	\$33,703			\$33,703	Funds the goals of the solid waste management plan including E-Waste collection, recycling education in the local school systems and organizations, and equipment repair and maintenance.	The grant funds personnel, hauling, redemption fees, equipment upkeep, and educational supplies and resources.
S	Pemiscot Progressive Industries	\$46,732	\$42,811			\$42,811	PPI collects, sorts, and markets recyclables, security shredding, and provides education to schools and communities.	With five approved grant requests totaling \$159,612.43 and \$146,219.10 available for funding, partial funding was accepted for this recurring project to fund personnel salaries for recycling normal and specialty times.
S	Cotton Boll Sheltered Workshop	\$47,632	\$43,635			\$43,635	CBSW collects, sorts, and markets recyclables, security shredding and baling, clothing textiles recycling. They also participate in E-Waste Round Up events. They are accepting all glass for recycling. Agriculture: collect cotton modular tarps, seed bags, and Polyethylene Wrap (John Deere Plastic), watermelon and pumpkin gaylords (cardboard) from area farmers. Collecting: scrap metals such as aluminum, aluminum cans, tins, white goods.	With five approved grant requests totaling \$159,612.43 and \$146,219.10 available for funding, partial funding was accepted for this recurring project to fund personnel salaries for recycling normal and specialty times.
S	Scott County Recycling	\$10,588	\$9,699			\$9,699	Removing and sorting recyclable materials from road sides and ditches: cardboard, cans, paper, plastic and tires. They will repair and maintain the Pickup Truck and Box Truck.	With five approved grant requests totaling \$159,612.43 and \$146,219.10 available for funding, partial funding was accepted for this recurring project to fund personnel salaries to collect items from county roadsides and ditches for recycling.

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
S	Stoddard County Sheltered Workshop	\$45,000	\$41,224			\$41,224	The SCSW will collect, sort, and market recyclable material. They provide recycling services to cities, schools, merchants, industries, and citizens in 5 counties: Stoddard, Scott, Mississippi, Dunklin, and New Madrid.	With five approved grant requests totaling \$159,612.43 and \$146,219.10 available for funding, partial funding was accepted for this recurring project to fund personnel salaries to perform recycling.
S	City of Scott City	\$9,661	\$8,850			\$8,850	The City of Scott City purchase recycled picnic tables and park benches to go in the city's new pavilions area to establish a new Farmer's Market for the city as well as other community events. The purpose is to help increase community involvement and give citizens a centralized covered gathering area in a safe environment. In addition, the area will contain recycle containers that will then be dropped off at the shelter in Scott County. This project is the part of the city's continued efforts to beautify the city and further community involvement.	With five approved grant requests totaling \$159,612.43 and \$146,219.10 available for funding, partial funding was accepted by this new project to purchase tables and benches made of recycled materials for the city pavilion area.
T	No information submitted for this report.							

## ATTACHMENT B

## FY2021 DISTRICT UNFUNDED PROJECTS

### Unfunded Grant Projects – FY2021

District	Organization	Preliminary Application - Did not submit final Application (X)	Amount Requested	Low score or incomplete	Insufficient Grant Funds	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
E	Scraps KC		\$43,057	x		Diversion Capacity	Requested funding for items not directly leading to waste diversion.
E	Missouri Organic Recycling		\$40,620	x		Food too Good to Waste Project	Concerns with COVID school closings and ability to deliver classroom presentations.
E	Westside CAN Center		\$39,690	x		Healthy Community	The application did not meet the threshold of 85 points to be considered for funding.
E	ecoTire		\$900,000	x		ecoShred Phase II	The application did not meet the threshold of 85 points to be considered for funding.
E	After the Harvest		\$21,692	x		Go Green Initiative	Incomplete application
E	Kansas City Composting		\$150,000	x		Compost Improvements	The application did not meet the threshold of 85 points to be considered for funding.
E	NE Chamber of Commerce		\$47,074	x		Independence Avenue Expansion Phase II	Incomplete application
E	Blue Valley Neighborhood Assoc.	x	\$800			Recycling Education	
E	Joseph Mandacina	x	\$77,500			Collect hard to recycle items and glass	
E	Truman Heritage	x	\$30,000			Containers and fork lift	
E	Goodwill	x	\$350,000			Construction for New Store	
E	The Tellus Group	x	\$45,570			Consulting for Independent Living Facilities	
E	Joseph Mandacina	x	\$70,000			Glass Recycling in Blue Springs and GV	
E	Infinite Pioneer Solutions	x	\$49,700			Lumber reuse	
E	Sleepyhead Beds	x	\$35,000			Program Manager	
E	Compost Collective	x	\$6,000			Bin Swap Program	
E	Heart of the City	x	\$70,000			Illegal Dumping	
E	Compost Collective	x	\$7,500			Educational Event	
E	GreenworksKC	x	\$45,700			Reuse	
E	Glass Bandit	x	\$85,000			Glass Recycling Equipment	

District	Organization	Preliminary Application - Did not submit final Application (X)	Amount Requested	Low score or incomplete	Insufficient Grant Funds	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
E	Elm Dirt	x	\$49,900			Composting	
E	Jedadiah Robey	x	\$30,000			Multi-family Recycling	
E	Mattie Rhodes Center	x	\$45,800			Recycling Education	
E	Heart of the City Neighborhood Assoc.	x	\$30,000			Composting	
E	Meredith Used Cars Sales and Recycling	x	\$25,000			Hook-Lift Bed	
E	The Kansas City Public Library	x	\$10,000			Cardboard Baler	
E	Kanbes Markets	x	\$150,000			Procurement Manager	
E	Truman Heritage Habitat for Humanity	x	\$15,000			Expansion Feasibility Study	
E	Carl Stafford	x	\$45,000			Pick Up Truck, limbs	
G	City of Bowling Green		\$3,000	X		Funding was requested to host a tire recycling event in the City of Bowling Green.	
K	St. James Caring Center	X	\$11,500			The Center currently recycles textiles from their thrift store and they would like to increase donations of metals/appliance to increase their revenues. Their grant request is for a dump trailer for reducing the number of trips to the scrap metal dealer. Staff contacted MDNR for guidance on the storage of electronics and the handling of unwanted materials, e.g. T.V.s. The applicant has been asked to submit a list of acceptable and unacceptable items for their program and a plan for properly managing unwanted items.	Applicant did not submit a revision to the original submission as requested by staff and MDNR for more information.
L	N.B. West Contracting Company		\$150,000			Asphalt/Concrete Impact Crushing Machine	
L	Waste Connections of Missouri, Inc.		\$26,212			Sustainability Campus Interpretive Center	
M	All Points Recycling		\$20,300	x		Tool for determining plastic grades and density	Average score less than 100

District	Organization	Preliminary Application - Did not submit final Application (X)	Amount Requested	Low score or incomplete	Insufficient Grant Funds	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
M	Triple R Recycling		\$47,000	x		Kiln for heat-treating wooden pallets	Average score less than 100
M	La-Z-Boy		\$26,350	x		Recycling bins to replace existing ones	Average score less than 100
N	City of Crane		\$5,871		\$3,000.00	The City of Crane used grant funds to host an E-Recycling (electronic recycling) event at their community recycling center. Funding for this event allowed them to supplement the cost of recycling outdated and non-working electronics which would ordinarily be improperly disposed of by local residents. These funds helped to conserve the City's already limited resources. The event was very successful and attendance was high. The City had originally asked for \$3,000 to also hold a tire drive during this electronics event; however, due to limited funds by District N, and DNR stating that funds could not be used for a free drive; \$3,000 of this grant was unfunded. They were only awarded \$2,871.04 for the Electronic recycling event.	The City had originally asked for \$3,000 to also hold a tire drive during this electronics event; however, due to limited funds by District N, and DNR stating that funds could not be used for a free drive; \$3,000 of this grant was unfunded. They were only awarded \$2,871.04 for the Electronic recycling event.
S	DAEOC		\$48,869	Yes		The Sikeston Head Start Playground Revitalization Project will be administered and coordinated by the Delta Area Economic Opportunity Corporation. It will continue the center's usage of recycled materials at this specific facility. By using shredded tire as resilient playground cover over 5600 square feet and at a depth of 4 inches, this project will divert 7,181 tires from our landfills. The use of shredded tire also reduces the need for annual resurfacing and, thus, results in lowered costs for playground maintenance. Once the revitalization project is completed, we anticipate continued success in the usage of recycled material and to use	Application did not reach low score threshold of 70%.

District	Organization	Preliminary Application - Did not submit final Application (X)	Amount Requested	Low score or incomplete	Insufficient Grant Funds	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
						the positive results of this project to support the expanded use of shredded tire at all Head Start facilities.	
S	City of Kennett		\$49,500	Yes		The City of Kennett has established a non-profit entity to compost all city organic debris, City Compost Facility, which efficiently processes thousands of tons of organic material into compost using only a tractor and a compost aerator. The tractor is worn out and needs to be replaced. This service allows citizens the opportunity to get rid of all organic debris in their yards, improving safety by reducing the fire hazards and multiple drainage issues that once occurred throughout the city. It has saved the city thousands of dollars in fire expenses, labor costs, and street repairs.	Application did not reach low score threshold of 70%.

## ATTACHMENT C

### PROPOSED REVISIONS

#### 10 CSR 80-9.050 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FUND—DISTRICT GRANTS

*When first prepared, SWAB had been asked to review and make recommendations for streamlining existing regulations. Currently there is pending litigation regarding some of the topics included in Attachment C. SWAB has not and will not take a position on the pending litigation. Recommendations included in Attachment C, prepared in 2017, do not support any position in this litigation.*

## **Rules of**

# **Department of Natural Resources**

## **Division 80—Solid Waste Management**

### **Chapter 9—Solid Waste Management Fund**

#### **10 CSR 80-9.050 Solid Waste Management Fund—District Grants**

##### **Title 10—DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES**

##### **Division 80—Solid Waste Management**

##### **Chapter 9—Solid Waste Management Fund**

#### **10 CSR 80-9.050 Solid Waste Management Fund—District Grants**

*PURPOSE: This rule contains procedures and provisions for solid waste management districts to qualify for grant funds from the Solid Waste Management Fund as provided for in section 260.335.2, RSMo.*

*PUBLISHER'S NOTE: The publication of the full text of the material that the adopting agency has incorporated by reference in this rule would be unduly cumbersome or expensive. Therefore, the full text of that material will be made available to any interested person at both the Office of the Secretary of State and the office of the adopting agency, pursuant to section 536.031.4, RSMo. Such material will be provided at the cost established by state law.*

(1) Definitions. Definitions for key words used in this rule may be found in 10 CSR 80- 2.010.

Additional definitions specific to this rule are as follows:

(A) Allocated district funds. Monies from the Solid Waste Management Fund that are set aside to be disbursed to each district by the department;

(B) Competitive bid process. Procurement of goods or services that follows the guidelines outlined in 1 CSR 40;

(C) Disbursed district funds. District funds paid to each district or ~~subgranteegrantee~~;

(D) Disposal cost. Fees charged to collect, transport or deposit solid waste in a landfill, transfer station or other approved facility;

~~(E) District administrative grant. Planning and organizational grants disbursed by the department to each district prior to August 28, 2004;~~

(F) District carryover. Any remaining district funds of any completed grants that have been disbursed by the department to each district for ~~district administrative grants~~, district operations grants, plan implementation grants or district ~~subgrants grants~~;

(G) District funds. The revenue generated from the solid waste tonnage fee collected and deposited in the Solid Waste Management Fund and allocated to each district pursuant to section 260.335.2, RSMo, plus district carryover, and interest income earned ~~and state required local match funds~~;

(H) Executive board. The board established by each district's solid waste management council or by the alternative management structure chosen by a district as provided for in section 260.315.4(2), RSMo;

(I) Interest income. All interest earned by each district from the holding of revenue generated from the Solid Waste Management Fund;

(J) Project. All approved components of an organized undertaking described in a proposal, including any supporting documents as required by project type;

(K) Solid Waste Management Fund. The fund created in section 260.330, RSMo, to receive the tonnage fee charges submitted by sanitary and demolition landfills for waste disposed of in Missouri and transfer stations for waste transported out of state for disposal;

(L) State required local match funds. Funds committed by local governments to each district as match for district administrative grants; and

(M) Unencumbered district funds. District funds that have not been obligated by the executive board for goods and services in the form of purchase orders, contracts or other form of documentation.

(2) Eligibility.

(A) Applicability. This rule applies to the members of the executive boards of all department-recognized solid waste management districts in Missouri.

(B) Projects. The district funds are to be allocated for projects in accordance with the following provisions:

~~1. Grant monies made available by this rule shall be allocated by the district for projects contained within the district's approved solid waste management plan.~~ These funds will be used for solid waste management projects as approved by the ~~department~~executive board. However, no grant funds will be made available for incineration without energy recovery;

~~2. In the event that the district solid waste management plan has not been submitted to the department, any eligible projects approved by the district and allocated monies made available by this rule shall be included in the district's solid waste management plan prior to submission;~~

~~3. In the event that the district solid waste management plan has been submitted to the department, any eligible projects approved by the district and allocated monies made available by this rule, but not contained within the plan, shall be considered an addenda to the plan. The addenda will be evidenced in quarterly and final project reports required under subsection (6)(B) of this rule. Projects serving as addenda to the plan in this manner must be included in any documents required by the department to be submitted by the districts that update the plan or that verify implementation of the plan pursuant to section 260.325.5, RSMo;~~

4. District funds shall not be awarded for a project whose applicant is directly involved in the evaluation and ranking of that particular project;

5. District funds shall not be awarded for a project that displaces existing resource recovery services, unless the proposed project demonstrates how it will result in improvement or expansion of service; and

6. District funds shall not be awarded for a project that collects curbside municipal solid waste solid waste for disposal on a continuous basis.

(C) Grant Funds.Funding:

1. As determined by statute, an amount of the revenue generated from the solid waste tonnage fee collected and deposited in the Solid Waste Management Fund shall be allocated annually to the executive board of each officially recognized solid waste management district for district grants. Further, each officially recognized solid waste management district shall be allocated, upon appropriation, a minimum amount for district grants pursuant to section 260.335.2, RSMo.

2. ~~The district shall enter into a financial assistance agreement with the department prior to the disbursement of district funds.~~ The financial assistance agreement shall, at a minimum, specify that all district funds will be managed in accordance with statute and this rule. Financial assistance agreements shall be provided to the districts by the department at the beginning of the state fiscal year.

3. Quarterly the department shall notify transfer to the executive board of each district of the amount of grant funds for which the district is eligible. Upon request, the department will provide to a district the reported tonnages and tonnage fees paid into the Solid Waste Management Fund. The Districts shall utilize funds in accordance with state statute and this rule.

4. ~~Grant money available to a district under subsection (2)(C) of this rule within a fiscal year may be allocated for district operations, projects that further plan implementation and subgrantee projects of cities and counties within the district pursuant to section 260.335.2, RSMo.~~

5. ~~Any district funds allocated to a district but not requested by the district following the procedures outlined in this rule within twenty-four (24) months of the end of the state fiscal year in which it was allocated may be reallocated by the department pursuant to section 260.335.2, RSMo.~~

6. At the end of a district's fiscal year, any district carryover funds ~~from closed district grants and interest income in excess of twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000)~~ shall be allocated for projects other than district operations in the district's next request for project proposals in accordance with section 260.335, RSMo, unless approved by the department.

7. A solid waste management district may elect to use more than one fiscal year's allocation of funds to finance a project. Prior to the department encumbering funds for this project, the district shall ~~notify submit a request to the department for approval that provides justification and financial supporting documentation.~~

8. ~~Following the department's approval, the district may request that these funds be transmitted to the district. All interest income earned by the district shall be obligated to this project until the total amount needed is reached.~~

9. All district funds shall be used for ~~implementation of a solid waste management plan, district operations and, solid waste management, waste reduction, recycling and related services~~ ~~waste reduction, recycling and related services~~ grants and plan implementation projects as approved by the district executive board and the department.

(D) Costs. In general, the following paragraphs list eligible and ineligible costs for district funds. Items not listed in this section or in subsections (3)(A) and (4)(B) ~~should may be discussed with the department approved by the district executive board, after discussions with the department.~~

1. Eligible costs. Applicants can request monetary assistance in the operation of eligible projects for the following types of costs. Eligible costs may vary depending on the services, materials and activities, as specified in the grant application:

- A. Collection, processing, manufacturing or hauling equipment;
- B. Materials and labor for construction of buildings;
- C. Engineering or consulting fees;
- D. Salaries and related fringe benefits directly related to the project;
- E. Equipment installation costs including installation, freight or retrofitting of the equipment;
- F. Development and distribution of informational materials;
- G. Planning and implementation of informational forums including, but not limited to, workshops;
- H. Travel as necessary for project completion
- I. Overhead costs directly related to the project;
- J. Laboratory analysis costs; and
- K. Professional services.

2. Ineligible costs. The following costs are considered ineligible for district grant funding:

A. Operating expenses, such as salaries and expenses that are not directly related to district operations or the project activities;

- B. Costs incurred before the project start date or after the project end date;
- C. ~~State Sales~~ Taxes;
- D. Legal costs;
- E. Contingency funds;
- F. Land acquisition;
- G. Gifts;

H. Disposal costs, except for ~~electronics, household hazardous waste, or other diversion projects as deemed appropriate by district executive boards~~ projects as indicated in paragraph (2)(B)6. of this rule;

- I. Fines and penalties;
- J. Food and beverages for district employees, board members or ~~grants subgrantee grantees~~ at non-working meetings;

K. Memorial donations for board members, district employees, or ~~grants-subgrantee grantees~~;  
L. Office decorations, except as indicated in paragraph (3)(A)4. of this rule; and  
M. Lobbyists, pursuant to section 105.470, RSMo.

(3) District Operations.

(A) Eligible Costs. The department shall allocate funding for the costs that are reasonable and necessary for proper and efficient performance and administration of the district. District operations costs must be specifically for the purpose of district operations and may include:

1. Salaries and related fringe benefits of employees;
2. Cost of materials and supplies acquired, consumed or expended;
3. Rental or leasing of office space;
4. Office decorations costing less than five hundred dollars (\$500) per year;
5. Equipment and other capital expenditures;
6. Travel expenses incurred;
7. The cost of utilities, insurance, security, janitorial services, upkeep of grounds, normal repairs and alterations and the like to the extent that they keep property at an efficient operating condition, do not add to the permanent value of property or appreciably prolong the intended life and are not otherwise included in rental or other charges for space;
8. Contracted services for eligible costs acquired through a competitive bid process;
9. Non-cash service awards which are reasonable in cost; and
10. Legal costs for contract review and other costs directly related to the district ~~grant~~ administration.

(B) District Operations Budget Grant Application. Districts eligible to ~~Expend receive~~ district operations ~~grant~~ funding shall Provide submit a written notice request to the department, on forms provided by the department, that includes:

1. A completed district operations budget, containing such detail as specified by the department, that has been approved by the executive board, including an executive summary and list of tasks for the budget period.
2. Copies of any contracts in effect for district operations services.
3. ~~If applicable, documentation of the bidding process used to procure district operations services.~~
4. The grant and budget period shall cover up to a one (1)-year time period, unless otherwise approved by the department.
5. Districts may apply submit for district operations funds at any time during the year, provided that all requirements outlined in this section are followed.

(4) Plan Implementation Projects.

(A) Projects. The ~~department district executive board may shall~~ allocate plan implementation funds for projects in accordance with the following provisions:

1. ~~Grant monies Funds~~ made available by this rule shall be allocated by the district for projects contained within the district's solid waste management plan or which enable the district to plan and implement activities pursuant to section 260.325, RSMo;
2. Projects shall be conducted by district staff or through a contract with the district. Contracted services must be procured through a competitive bid process;
3. ~~Projects should benefit the counties or cities who are members of the district; and~~
4. A project period shall be determined that allows for the purpose of the project to be accomplished and for adequate reporting of the results of the project to determine if the project met its intended goals. Project and budget periods may allow for up to a two (2)-year time period for project completion. An extension may be approved beyond the 2-year time period by the district executive board. maximum of one (1) six (6)-month extension may be allowed beyond the two (2) years when approved by the executive board.

~~Any extension of the project or budget periods beyond two (2) years and six (6) months must have the prior approval of the executive board and the department.~~

(B) Eligible Costs. Districts may ~~request monetary assistance~~ allocate funds in the operation of eligible plan implementation projects for the types of costs listed in paragraph (2)(D)1. of this rule. Eligible costs may also include costs associated with revising the district's solid waste management plan.

(C) Grant Application Budgets. Districts eligible to receive plan implementation ~~grant~~ funding shall submit ~~a written request notice~~ to the department that includes copies of all plan implementation project proposals approved by the executive board as documented in meeting minutes. At a minimum, project proposals must include:

1. An executive summary of the project objectives and the problem to be solved, referencing the district's solid waste management plan, if applicable, component to which it applies;
2. The location of the project, project name, and the project number assigned by the district;
3. A work plan which identifies project tasks, the key personnel and their qualifications;
4. A timetable showing anticipated dates for major planned activities and expenditures, including the submittal of ~~quarterly a final report~~s and the final report;
5. A budget that includes an estimate of the costs for conducting the project. Estimates shall be provided for all major planned activities or purchases by category;
6. Documentation that all required proposal content has been received and reviewed by the district executive board including cost estimates, verification that all applicable federal, state and local permits, approvals, licenses or waivers necessary to implement the project are either not needed or have been applied for, and demonstration of compliance with local zoning ordinances;
7. The type of waste and estimated tonnage to be diverted from landfills or other measurable outcomes;
8. A description of the evaluation procedures to be used throughout the project to measure the success or benefit of the project;
9. For projects involving awards over fifty thousand dollars (\$~~50100~~,000), supporting documentation must be provided to demonstrate technical feasibility, including a preliminary project design, preliminary engineering plans and specifications for any facilities and equipment required for a proposed project, if applicable; and ~~10. If requested by the department, copies of any or all approved project proposals and supporting documents.~~

(5) District GrantSubgranteeGrantee Procedures.

(A) Notification by the Districts. The district executive boards shall request project proposals by giving written notification to the governing officials of each member county and city over five hundred (500) in population. ~~and by publishing a notice in a newspaper officially designated by the chief elected official of each member county, for public notices for every member county and city with a population over five hundred (500) within the district. The district executive board shall provide the written notification and newspaper notice at least thirty (30) days prior to when proposals are due. If the district executive board will request project proposals more often than annually, the district executive board may issue the written notification and newspaper notice annually specifying when the district will be accepting project proposals for the upcoming year.~~

(B) Proposal Content and Supporting Documents. The districts shall, as appropriate, require the proposals to include but not be limited to the following information:

1. An executive summary of the project objectives and the problem to be solved, referencing the district's solid waste management plan component to which it applies;
2. The location of the project and name, address and phone number of the official subgrant recipient(s);

3. A work plan which identifies project tasks, the key personnel and their qualifications;
4. A timetable showing anticipated dates for major planned activities and expenditures, including the submittal of ~~quarterly reports and~~ the final report;
5. A budget that includes an estimate of the costs for conducting the project. Estimates shall be provided for all major planned activities or purchases by category and shall be supported by documentation showing how each cost estimate was determined. If the project includes matching funds, the budget must delineate the percentages and dollar amounts of the total project costs for both district funds and applicant contributions;
6. Verification that all applicable federal, state and local permits, approvals, licenses or waivers necessary to implement the project are either not needed or have been obtained or applied for and will be obtained prior to an award;
7. Demonstration of compliance with local zoning ordinances;
8. A description of the evaluation procedures to be used throughout the project to quantitatively and qualitatively measure the success or benefit of the project;
9. Documentation that shows a commitment for the match, if applicable;
10. The following supporting documents for projects, except education projects, involving allocations over fifty thousand dollars (\$~~50100~~,000), if applicable:
  - A. To demonstrate technical feasibility, a preliminary project design, preliminary engineering plans and specifications for any facilities and equipment required for a proposed project, if applicable;
  - B. A financial report including:
    - (I) A three (3)-year business or strategic plan for the proposed project. ~~For projects involving recycling and reuse technologies, the plan shall include a market analysis with information demonstrating that the applicant has secured the supply of and demand for recovered material and recycled products necessary for sustained business activity;~~
    - (II) A description of project financing, including projected revenue from the project; and
    - (III) A confidential credit history; and/or up to three (3) years' previous financial statements or reports; or for governmental entities a bond rating;
11. Confidential business information and availability of information. Any person may assert a claim of business confidentiality covering a part or all of that information by including a letter with the information which requests protection of specific information from disclosure. Confidentiality shall be determined or granted in accordance with Chapter 610, RSMo. However, if no claim accompanies the information when it is received by the ~~department~~ district, the information may be made available to the public without further notice to the person submitting it; and
12. In the event that more than one (1) solid waste management district proposes to participate in a project as joint subgrantee grantees, each participating district's responsibilities will be outlined in the subgrantee grantee Financial Assistance Agreement. One (1) of the participating districts must be designated as project manager. The project will be administered as provided for in sections (5) and (6) of this rule.

(C) A project period shall be determined that will allow an adequate time period for the subgrantee grantee to accomplish the purpose of the project and provide reporting of the results and accomplishments. Project and budget periods may allow for up to a two (2) year time period for project completion. A n extension may be approved beyond the 2-year time period by the district executive board, maximum of one (1) six (6) month extension may be allowed beyond the two (2) years when approved by the executive board. Any extension of the project or budget periods beyond two (2) years and six (6) months must have the prior approval of the executive board and the department.

(D) Proposal Review and Evaluation. The executive boards must review, rank and approve proposals as outlined in this subsection. The executive board may appoint a committee to review and rank proposals. The executive board shall make final approval.

1. Review for eligibility and completeness. For all proposals received by the deadline as established in their public notices to the media, the board shall determine the eligibility of the applicant, the eligibility of the proposed project, the eligibility of the costs identified in the proposal and the completeness of the proposal.

2. Notice of eligibility and completeness. If the district executive board determines that the applicant or the project is ineligible or incomplete, the board may reject the proposal and shall notify the applicant. A project may be resubmitted up to the application deadline.

3. Proposal evaluation. The executive board or their appointed committee shall evaluate each proposal that is determined to be eligible and complete. The board will develop a District Targeted Materials List to be used as one of the evaluation criteria. The evaluation method will include the following criteria, as appropriate per project category:

A. Conformance with the integrated waste management hierarchy as described in the *Missouri Policy on Resource Recovery*, as incorporated by reference in this rule;

B. Conformance with the District Targeted Materials List;

C. Degree to which the project contributes to community-based economic development;

D. District funds shall not be awarded for a project that displaces existing resource recovery services, unless the proposed project demonstrates how it will result in improvement or expansion of service. Degree to which funding to the project will adversely affect existing private entities in the market segment; (re-write to cater to eval criteria)

E. Degree to which the project promotes waste reduction or recycling or results in an environmental benefit related to solid waste management through the proposed process;

F. ~~Demonstrates cooperative efforts through a public/private partnership or among political subdivisions;~~

G. Compliance with federal, state or local requirements;

H. ~~Transferability of results;~~

I. ~~The need for the information;~~

J. Technical and managerial ability of the applicant;

~~K. Managerial ability of the applicant;~~

L. Ability to implement in a timely manner;

M. Technical feasibility;

N. Availability of feedstock;

O. Level of commitment for financing; and

~~P. Type of contribution by applicant;~~

~~Q. Effectiveness of marketing strategy;~~

R. Quality of budget; and

~~S. Selected financial ratios.~~

4. The executive board shall develop minimum criteria for the approval of project grant funding

(6) District Documentation.

(A) Grant subgrantee Proposals. The following documentation must be submitted by the district to the department as part of the grant application documentation process:

1. A completed project request summary form provided by the department that includes, at a minimum, the following information:

A. Copies of the executive summaries of the eligible proposals submitted to the executive board, or narratives prepared by the district, that describe the location of project, project objectives, tasks and general timeline of each eligible proposal;

B. For each project approved for an award by the executive board indicate the name of the project, the project number assigned by the district and:

(I) The total amount awarded to each project, what amount is awarded from the current undisbursed allocation funding, any carryover from previous awards by the district and the source of the carryover, and any interest accrued by the district;

(II) The project budget by category;

(III) The type of waste and estimated tonnage to be diverted from landfills or other measurable outcomes;

(IV) The project start and stop dates; and

(V) Application checklist shall serve as documentation that all required proposal content has been received and reviewed by the district;

2. The aggregate executive board rankings for each of the eligible proposals or documentation that the proposals meet the minimum criteria for funding set by the executive board using the evaluation criteria as described in paragraph (5)(D)3.;

3. ~~If requested by the department, copies of any or all approved project proposals and supporting documents;~~

4. A copy of the notices given to the governing bodies ~~and published in the newspapers within the district within the district;~~

5. A copy of the ~~subgrantee~~grantee(s) financial assistance agreement between the district and ~~subgrantee~~grantee(s), any amendments made to the ~~subgrantee~~grantee(s) financial assistance agreement indicated in subsection (7)(H) of this rule and invoice; and

6. Documentation that the executive board discussions and votes for approved ~~subgrants~~grants took place in open session, in accordance with sections 610.010 to 610.200 of the Missouri Sunshine Law.

(B) Quarterly Reports Semi-annual Status Reports. On ~~quarterly~~status semi-annual report forms provided by the department, the district shall submit the following information to the department thirty (30) days after the end of each 6-month period ~~state fiscal year quarter~~:

1. Project status. For each ~~plan implementation and~~ district ~~subgrantee~~grant project in progress the district shall provide:

A. The details of progress addressing the project tasks outlined in the ~~plan implementation application or~~ ~~subgrantee~~grantee financial assistance agreement;

B. Problems encountered in project execution;

C. Budget adjustments made within budget categories, with justifications;

D. The weight in tons of waste diverted for each type of recovered material utilized in the project for the most recent ~~quarter~~ 6-month period following the implementation of the diversion activity or other measurable outcomes, as appropriate;

E. A copy of an amended ~~subgrantee~~grantee financial assistance agreement, if appropriate; and

F. Other information necessary for proper evaluation of the progress of the projects.

2. In the event that a time period for a project is less than a full year, only ~~quarterly~~ semi-annual information appropriate to the project time period need be included in the district report.

3. Project financial summary. For each grant (district operations, plan implementation and district ~~subgrantee~~grantee project) the district shall provide;

A. The original award amount taken from the accrued allocation ~~held by the department~~;

B. Any district carryover used to fund a project or district operations;

C. Any accrued interest income used to fund a project or district operations;

D. Total grant award for that project or district operation (total of subparagraphs (6)(B)3.A., B., and C. of this rule);

E. Cumulative amount of district disbursement of funds to each ~~subgrantee~~grantee or to the district during that reporting period;

F. Balance of that project or district operations during that reporting period;

G. Any carryover funding held by the district that has not been obligated for projects or district operations; and

H. Any accrued interest income held by the district that has not been obligated for projects or district operations.

4. Final project reports. The district shall submit to the department a final report for each plan implementation or district ~~subgrantee~~grant project that shall contain the same information as described for project status in paragraph

(6)(B)1. of this rule, as well as a comparison of actual accomplishments to the goals established and a description as to how goals were either met, not met or were exceeded.

5. District operations status:

A. The details of progress in completing the district operations tasks outlined in the district operations budget application;

- B. Problems encountered in district operations;
- C. Required budget amendments; and

D. ~~Other information necessary for proper evaluation of district operations.~~

(C) District Annual Report. The district shall submit to the department within one hundred twenty (120) days of the end of the state fiscal year a report covering the following information for the state fiscal year:

1. Goals and accomplishments. A description of the district solid waste management goals, actions taken to achieve those goals and the goals that have been set for the upcoming state fiscal year;

2. Types of projects and results, including:

A. A summary of the projects that included goals to divert solid waste tonnage from landfills, including number and costs of projects, tons diverted and average cost per ton diverted, and other measurable outcomes achieved;

B. A summary of the projects that did not have waste diversion goals, including number and costs of projects, and measurable outcomes achieved; and

C. Separate statistics for items banned by statute from landfills and items that are not banned from landfills;

3. A description of the district's grant proposal evaluation process; and

4. A list of district council and executive board members, including their affiliation(s).

(7) Executive Board Accountability.

(A) The executive board shall comply with the department's reporting requirements, pursuant to section (6) of this rule.

(B) An executive board receiving funds from the Solid Waste Management Fund for district grants shall themselves maintain, and require recipients of financial assistance to maintain, an accounting system according to generally accepted accounting principles that accurately reflects all fiscal transactions, incorporates appropriate controls and safeguards, and provides clear references to the project as agreed to in the Financial Assistance Agreement. Accounting records must be supported by source documentation such as cancelled checks, paid bills, payrolls, time and attendance records, contract, and agreement award documents.

(C) The executive board shall adopt a conflict of interest policy regarding grants ~~to~~ subgrantees. This policy shall include a requirement that any non-governmental member of the executive board, or the business or institution to which the member is affiliated, who applies for district grants shall not review, score, rank or approve any of the subgrantee grant applications for the same grant call.

(D) Payments to grant recipients shall be on a reimbursement basis. The executive board shall retain fifteen percent (15%) of the funds from the recipient until the project is complete. A project shall be deemed complete when the project period has ended and the board gives approval to the grant recipient's final report and the final accounting of project expenditures. The district may make payment directly to a vendor instead of reimbursing the grant recipient provided the executive board approves the direct payment, goods or services being purchased by the grant recipient have been received, and the executive board retains fifteen percent (15%) of the funds until completion of the grant project. For reimbursements or direct payments, the district may release the fifteen percent (15%) retainage prior to completion of the grant project with prior approval of the executive board and the department.

(E) Retention and Custodial Requirements for Records.

1. The executive board shall retain all records and supporting documents directly related to the funds and projects for a period of three (3) years from the date of submission of the final status report and make them available to the department for audit or examination.

2. If any litigation, claim, negotiation, audit or other action involving the records has been started before the expiration of the three (3)-year period, the records must be retained until completion of the action and resolution of all issues which arise from it, or until the end of the regular three (3)-year period, whichever is later.

(F) All general and special terms and conditions of the ~~department~~ ~~district~~ applicable to the project will be applicable to recipients of awards made available by this chapter.

(G) The executive board shall address all deficiencies identified in a district's audit to the satisfaction of the department. Districts failing to adequately address deficiencies identified in the audit may have funds withheld or may be required to repay any and all disbursements of funds in accordance with section (9) of this rule.

~~(H) Funding for approved subgrants will be forwarded to the districts upon receipt of a completed, signed and dated invoice and subgrantee financial assistance agreement for each individual subgrant.~~

~~(I) Except as otherwise provided by law, within eighteen (18) months after the effective date of this rule, the executive board shall use a competitive bid process to obtain administrative services, office space rental, and other district operations services, except for employees who are directly employed by the district. Contracts shall not exceed five (5) years in duration.~~

(J) The executive board shall have their records audited by a certified public accountant or firm of certified public accountants pursuant to section 260.325, RSMo. Districts shall arrange to have the audit conducted and submit to the department a complete audit report prepared by the certified public accountant or firm of certified public accountants within one hundred eighty (180) days of the end of the period covered by the audit. ~~(re-write to reflect current statutes)~~

(K) For capital assets over ~~ten five~~ thousand dollars (\$~~105~~,000) purchased in whole or in part with district funds and in which a security interest is held, the executive board must maintain property records. At a minimum these records shall include a description of the equipment, a serial number or other identification number, ~~the source of the property the name of the seller~~, the acquisition date, cost of the property, percentage of state funds used in the cost of the property, and the location, use and condition of the property.

(L) The executive board shall insure that a physical inventory is conducted of property purchased with district funds and the results reconciled with the property records at least once every two (2) years.

(M) For capital assets over ~~ten five~~ thousand dollars (\$~~105~~,000) purchased in whole or in part with district funds, by the district or ~~subgrantee~~grantee, the executive board shall ensure that insurance is procured and maintained that will cover loss or damage to the capital assets with financially sound and reputable insurance companies or through self- insurance, in such amounts and covering such risks as are usually carried by companies engaged in the same or similar business and similarly situated.

(N) Pursuant to section 260.320.3, RSMo, the executive board ~~shall~~ may appoint one (1) or more advisory committees and ensure that the advisory committee(s) meet annually, at a minimum.

~~(O) Planning Requirements. Pursuant to section 260.325, RSMo, the board shall review the district's solid waste management plan at least every twenty-four (24) months for the purpose of evaluating the district's progress in meeting the requirements and goals of the plan, and shall submit plan revisions to the department and council. At a minimum, the executive board shall submit plan revisions by April 1 of each odd-numbered year that include, but are not limited to:~~

1. An inventory of solid waste services in the planning area on forms provided by the department. Service information shall include:

- A. The solid waste collection services available to residential and commercial customers;
- B. The recycling services available to residential and commercial customers;
- C. The services available for management of items banned from Missouri landfills, pursuant to section 260.250, RSMo; and
- D. The services available for management of household hazardous wastes;

2. Pursuant to section 260.320.3, RSMo, a list of advisory boards, members of each and documentation of meetings; and

3. A description of illegal dumping identification, public education and household hazardous waste activities and programs established by the executive board, pursuant to section 260.320.3, RSMo.

(8) Awards.

(A) District Awards. All district ~~grant awards funds are subject to the state appropriation process will be disbursed to the~~. ~~District grant awards will be disbursed to the~~ district as provided for in subsection (2)(C) of this rule within thirty (30) days of the receipt by the department of all applicable applications and documentation per sections (3), (4), and (6) of this rule from the executive board of the district. In the case of questions regarding specific costs contained in the district operations application, the funds for costs not in question will be disbursed to the district.

(B) District Subgrantee Grant Project Awards.

- 1. All district ~~subgrantee~~-grant awards are subject to the appropriation process.
- 2. Before the districts distribute awarded funds to a ~~subgrantee grantee~~, the ~~subgrantee grantee~~ shall do the following:
  - A. Obtain all applicable federal, state and local permits, approvals, licenses or waivers required by law and necessary to implement the project;
  - B. Enter into a ~~subgrantee grantee~~ financial assistance agreement, or an amended ~~subgrantee grantee~~ financial assistance agreement if appropriate, issued by the district which is consistent with the Solid Waste Management Law and department rules and all terms and conditions of the district's financial assistance agreement; and
  - C. Are in compliance with reporting requirements. Submit all required quarterly and final reports.

(9) Withholding of District Funds.

(A) The department may withhold or reduce district grant awards until the district is in compliance with the following:

- 1. Solid Waste Management Law and regulations;
- 2. ~~Planning requirements pursuant to section 260.325, RSMo;~~
- 3. All general and special terms and conditions of the district's financial assistance agreement;
- 4. Audit requirements;
- 5. Resolution of significant audit findings ~~and questioned costs~~; and
- 6. All reporting requirements ~~and plan revisions~~ indicated in this rule.

(B) The department shall provide written notice of noncompliance prior to the withholding of funds, unless the severity of a significant audit finding requires the immediate withholding of funds. Such notice shall allow a minimum of thirty (30) days for the district to submit the documentation or conduct other tasks as indicated in the department's notice.

(C) If a district fails to submit to the department a complete quarterly semi-annual report, annual report or plan revision by the due date indicated in the department's notice of noncompliance, the department ~~shall may withhold and reallocate funds equal to one percent (1%) hundred dollars of the district's most recent quarterly allocation~~ for each day past the notice due date, unless these provisions have been met:

1. The district has requested an extension prior to the notice due date and the department has granted an extension;

2. The district has submitted a complete report by the date indicated in the department approved extension; and
3. The department shall use the postmark date as the date submitted by the district. If no postmark date is available, the department shall use the date the department receives the report.
  - (D) For ~~questioned ineligible costs identified through the audit process~~ ~~costs that the department determines to be inappropriate or unnecessary~~, the district shall repay the department or the department shall withhold from the district's allocation the amount of the cost, following the department's written request.
  - (E) For funds withheld from a district or repaid by a district, ~~the department shall reallocate~~ these funds ~~shall be reallocated~~ to all districts that, at the time of the reallocation, are in compliance with all requirements and have addressed all deficiencies identified in a district's audit ~~to the satisfaction of the department~~. The reallocation shall be made to districts in accordance with the allocation criteria pursuant to section 260.335, RSMo.

(10) Dispute Resolution. The district and the department shall attempt to resolve disagreements concerning the administration or performance of the district. If an agreement cannot be reached within ninety (90) days of the issuance of the notice of noncompliance, the department's Solid Waste Management Program director will provide a written decision. The Solid Waste Management Program director may consult with the Solid Waste Advisory Board prior to providing this decision. Such decision of the program director shall be final unless a request for review is submitted to the ~~Division of Environmental Quality director~~ ~~Administrative Hearing Commission (AHC)~~ within thirty (30) days of the receipt of the program director's decision. ~~A district requesting AHC review shall follow the administrative procedures of the AHC. The division director shall provide a final decision within thirty (30) days of the receipt of the district's request. A decision by the division director shall constitute final department action. Such request shall include:~~  
~~(A) A copy of the program director's written decision;~~  
~~(B) A statement of the amount in dispute;~~  
~~(C) A brief description of the issue(s) involved; and~~  
~~(D) A concise statement of the objections to the final decision.~~

**AUTHORITY:** sections 260.225, RSMo 2000 and 260.335, RSMo Supp. 2006.\* *Emergency rule filed Dec. 2, 1992,*

*effective Dec. 12, 1992, expired April 11, 1993. Original rule filed Dec. 2, 1992, effective Aug. 9, 1993.*

**Amended:**

*Filed Dec. 14, 1999, effective Aug. 30, 2000. Amended: Filed Jan. 5, 2007, effective Oct. 30, 2007. \*Original authority:*

*260.225, RSMo 1972, amended 1975, 1986, 1988, 1990, 1993, 1995 and 260.335, RSMo 1990, 1993, 1995, 2004, 2005.*

**Other comments:**

**Definitions need to be reviewed.**

~~Top of page 7, C2 solicited vs unsolicited projects. These refer to targeted grants that have been rescinded.~~

~~Leave~~

~~in, in case they need these.~~

**Page 8 number E, do not need district administrative grant.**

**L, State required local match funds.**

**Terms and Conditions, change 5 year security interest to 3 year security interest.**  
**Change advisory committee requirement in the law.**

## ATTACHMENT D

## 2021 SWAB LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

## **Missouri Solid Waste Advisory Board**

### **Legislative Recommendations**

*The following topics represent the current top legislative priorities for consideration by the State of Missouri. The Solid Waste Advisory Board voted on and approved the list at its regular board meeting on November 3, 2021. The SWAB is pleased to submit the following topics for discussion and consideration by the Joint Committee on Solid Waste Management District Operations.*

**Background:** The Missouri Solid Waste Advisory Board (SWAB) was formed in 1990 by SB 530 as a component of the Missouri Solid Waste Management Plan. (**260.345 RSMo.**–

[https://revisor.mo.gov/main/OneSection.aspx?section=260.345&bid=13937&hl=.\)](https://revisor.mo.gov/main/OneSection.aspx?section=260.345&bid=13937&hl=.))

**Purpose:** The purpose of the SWAB is to advise the Solid Waste Management Program (SWMP) of the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) in matters of solid waste management. Note: MDNR's 2019 reorganization efforts to gain additional efficiencies and effectiveness in program operations consolidated both solid waste and hazardous waste permitting and enforcement duties under a single program. The new program was renamed the Waste Management Program (WMP) and is referred to in place of the SWMP throughout the rest of this document.

**Composition:** The SWAB is comprised of the chairs of the executive boards of each of the 20 solid waste management districts or their designee (voting alternate) along with 5 additional members who are appointed to the board by the program director of the WMP. These members shall be two representatives of the solid waste management industry, one member from the waste composting or recycling industry, and two public members who have demonstrated an interest in solid waste management issues, but have no economic interest or activity with any solid waste facility or operation.

**Schedule:** The SWAB has regular meetings during which information from the WMP is shared and discussed, as well as information or concerns from those representatives of the districts, other SWAB members, associated agencies and organizations and the general public.

**Values and Beliefs:** The SWAB recognizes:

- Missouri citizens have a right to a healthy and clean environment and we are all responsible for the stewardship of natural resources for the well-being of current and future generations.
- Successful solid waste management must consider the diversity of Missouri's people and environment and be responsive to a range of needs and issues.
- Solid waste management practices must balance environmental and economic considerations.
- Quality solid waste management decisions are dependent upon an informed, knowledgeable public – education is an essential element.
- Laws and regulations must be consistently and equitably applied and enforced, requiring adequate regulatory staff and resources.
- Managing solid waste should be economically feasible for all Missouri citizens, businesses, and communities.
- Waste reduction practices, such as recycling, composting, re-use, energy recovery, etc., must be emphasized in solid waste management.

**Legislative Priorities and Considerations:**

The following topics represent the values and beliefs of SWAB as related to priorities for consideration by the State of Missouri. The SWAB voted on and approved the list at its regular board meeting on November 3, 2021. The SWAB recommends and supports legislative action that accomplishes or furthers efforts toward:

## **Solid Waste Reduction**

- **Establish a 75% waste diversion and reduction goal to expand Missouri's recycling industry.** Recycling has become a significant statewide industry that has created thousands of jobs, in addition to improving communities and protecting our environment. Increasing our diversion goal to 75% will generate additional economic growth and improve communities across Missouri. Missouri has about 25,000 recycling jobs, and increased recycling activity can create thousands of additional jobs.
- **Manage plastic bag waste, paint, lithium ion batteries, mattresses, pharmaceuticals, and electronic waste through Product Stewardship and Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR).** Product Stewardship and Extended Producer Responsibility have emerged as highly effective techniques to manage problem waste materials such as electronics, paint, plastic film, etc. Product stewardship creates a shift from the "back of the pipe" management of materials by recycling to "front of the pipe" management system. This emerging waste management approach is becoming standard practice and offers great potential for Missouri. This approach will reduce the burden on Missouri taxpayers to manage these problem wastes at the expense of local governments.
- **Maintain access to recycling programs for all Missouri citizens and businesses.** Local support of recycling through regional solid waste management districts has been a key factor in the growth and success of recycling in Missouri. Maintaining and strengthening local control will ensure the best use of resources and the implementation of projects best suited for local needs in a highly diverse state like Missouri. Local control and development, including support for the solid waste management districts is especially important for sustaining recycling programs in the rural areas of the state where economies of scale, transportation costs and smaller populations make recycling and waste reduction programs especially challenging. All Missouri citizens wish to have the opportunity to recycle and additional efforts need to be made to find innovative ways to foster the growth of rural waste reduction, composting, and recycling programs.
- **Support dispensing of public information/education.** The SWAB supports legislation and funding that provides information to the public regarding the importance of waste reduction programs, the correct methods of recycling and other related activities, location and types of waste reduction facilities and services, and on-line reference resources. This information is essential to the effective and efficient implementation and continuation of waste reduction/diversion programs and is most effectively delivered in a combination of state and locally appropriate messaging.
- **Support efforts to effectively manage new and emerging materials.** Historically, as new products have appeared in the marketplace, while filling a need and/or representing a considerable forward move toward more sustainable practices, the disposal/recycling/re-use of these products may require new methods, facilities, services or other innovative practices. Current examples include wind turbine blades and solar panels. SWAB supports the development of methods and/or facilities to address these and other emerging materials.
- **Retain Yardwaste Ban.** Yardwaste remains a valuable and easily recovered resource which, if not recycled or re-used, wastes valuable landfill space and removes easily integrated materials from use as soil amendments, soil erosion prevention devices, etc. This was recognized during the early Solid Waste Management Plan planning process and included in the original 1990 SB 530 legislation and remains just as applicable today (**260.250 RSMo.**).

## **Market Development /Industry Support**

- **Create incentives for investment to develop end-use markets for recovered materials in Missouri.** Making new products from recycled materials is a strong economic development opportunity that can generate good-paying

Missouri jobs. However, the Missouri Market Development Program has very limited funding. Program resources should be significantly increased to support the growth of end-users in Missouri. Recycling produces commodities that feed into a global marketplace, subject to fluctuations in price and demand. Developing strong, local end-use markets for recovered materials generated in Missouri helps recyclers weather market fluctuations. Expanding the Missouri Market Development program administered by the Environmental Improvement and Energy Resources Authority (EIERA) will create local jobs and provide a significant return on investment. The Market Development Program needs greater resources to help recycling continue to grow through the creation of value-added products made in Missouri.

- **Create incentives for business development at all stages – collection, processing, manufacturing, and marketing of products made from recycled materials.** Investing in the development of businesses that manufacture products from recycled materials is often essential to the establishment of new, innovative products and manufacturers. Likewise, marketing of products made from collected recyclable materials ensures a consistent flow of goods from collection center, through processors, to manufacturers and, finally, to the consuming public. All steps are critical to the success of the recycling effort.
- **In light of the Covid-19 Virus, designate recycling and related activities to be an “essential business.”** This not only protects the jobs created by the recycling industry, but also ensures that the associated recycling businesses remain open and operating so as not to interrupt services to the public or to create scarcity of materials available for end-user manufacturers. This would also include sheltered workshops or similar entities as they are frequently critical to local recycling efforts and provide much needed employment opportunities.
- **Include recycling businesses and industries in programs and efforts to bridge the economic gap caused by the Covid-19 Virus.** Following on the heels of historic low markets for recycled materials, the economic impacts of the Virus have created a significant financial hardship for businesses and industries in the recycling industry. SWAB supports the inclusion of recycling businesses and industries, as well as participating sheltered workshops in opportunities for economic relief through grants, loans, or other programs yet to be determined.

### **Responsible Disposal for Materials not Recycled**

- **Support consistent and equitably applied development and enforcement of waste management laws and regulations, including landfills, transfer stations, etc.** Landfills and transfer stations remain critical components in the safe and responsible management of solid waste in Missouri. Fair and equitable regulatory oversight is essential to the protection of our natural environment and in creating a level playing field to businesses involved in this facet of solid waste management. Adequate staff and other resources must be made available to MDNR in order to provide effective and fair enforcement activities.
- **Research extending the disposal fee to other regulated facilities in order to achieve fee equity.** All regulated facilities should contribute to the fund to cover regulatory expenses and allow the recycling funds to be used for their intended purpose. Recycling program grant requests vastly exceed available funds, and the ongoing diversion of funds has severely curtailed the growth of Missouri’s recycling industry.
- **Illegal dumping.** Support efforts and opportunities to assist MDNR and local regulatory agencies in ensuring the proper management of all solid waste.

### **Administrative**

- **Streamline District administrative procedures by implementing revisions to District administrative regulations, general terms, and administrative procedures.** Eliminating some requirements will reduce District administrative overhead and could save hundreds of thousands of dollars in administrative costs a year, allowing

District staff to focus more on expanding recycling. An independent study to identify opportunities to streamline District administrative regulations and procedures would be a highly worthwhile investment. Districts cannot significantly reduce administrative expenses unless current administrative requirements are streamlined.

**Data collection: Include volume and economic development components to the current measurement method when calculating the success rate of recycling programs. Success rates are currently calculated by only using weight.** Other

measurable impacts include participation rates, jobs created and jobs maintained, state and local tax revenues generated, landfill volume reductions, greenhouse gas reductions, resources conserved, etc. The number of tons diverted from disposal has been the only program measure for many years, and it has become insufficient as the only measure. There are numerous other ways to measure the benefits of recycling programs, and it is time to implement additional ways to measure program benefits. SWAB recognizes the value of applicable and reliable data and supports efforts to capture and share this information.

### **Support for the Missouri Department of Natural Resources and for the Solid Waste Management Districts**

- **Provide adequate and secure funding and resources for the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, including, the Waste Management Program.** MDNR remains the first and last safeguard of Missouri's natural resources. Citizens of the state care deeply about the quality of our natural environment and the ability to freely enjoy and utilize these resources. Likewise, businesses and industries depend on the fair and efficient delivery of regulatory services, technical assistance, and permitting services. It is essential that MDNR have the necessary authority and adequate resources, including staff, to provide for the protection of these resources and delivery of these services.
- **Oppose legislation that reduces the ability or flexibility of local jurisdictions to exercise local authority to address local waste management issues.** Local jurisdictions are the most responsive to the needs of their communities. Statewide legislation, which makes assumptions about what local communities need, denies them of programs that further professional solid waste management. Legislation, such as statewide plastic bag bans, do not serve community interests.

### **Contact Information**

The active, engaged, and knowledgeable members of the SWAB are available and welcome the opportunity to serve as a resource to provide further information and answer questions regarding the waste reduction and recycling efforts in Missouri.

Please feel free to contact:

Barbara J. Lucks, Chair  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
c/o Chris Nagel, Director  
Waste Management Program  
christopher.nagel@dnr.mo.gov  
573-751-5401  
Kelsi Watkins, Program Secretary  
kelsi.watkins@dnr.mo.gov  
573-526-3900

### **Reference Information –**

Hard copy: Includes a map of the districts, listing of districts and Board Chairs, listing of district planners

Electronic copy: Link to Solid Waste Management Division web page includes this same information:

<https://dnr.mo.gov/env/swmp/swmd/swmdinfo.htm>

## ATTACHMENT E

### COMPARISON OF MISSOURI SOLID WASTE LEGISLATION

## Comparison of Missouri Solid Waste Legislation

SB 530 -- 1990	SB225 -- 2005	HB 92 -- 2015
<b>Changes addressing the Solid Waste Advisory Board (SWAB) and/or funding or operations of the Solid Waste Management Districts (SWMD)</b>		
<p>Established the SWAB.</p> <p>Required final regional boundaries to be developed and adopted by 6/30/1991.</p> <p>Added a provision for one or more counties in a Region to form a SWMD.</p> <p>Established SWMD Councils consisting of city and county government officials or the Council may use a different organizational structure.</p> <p>Established a requirement for solid waste management plans for each SWMD, and any county or city with a population &gt;500 that was not part of a SWMD to develop and submit a solid waste management plan within 18 months of the SWMD formation.</p>	<p>Required regular audits of SWMDs- those receiving &gt;\$200,000- annual independent audit; those receiving &lt;\$200,000- an independent audit at least once every 2 years; and subject to resource limitations, the Department shall conduct performance audits at least once every 3 years.</p>	<p>Adjusted the frequency of audits and changed the authority of the state auditor to conduct audits of SWMDs from “shall” to “may” as the state auditor deems necessary and clarified the process and maximum amount that the auditor may request for reimbursement of these audits.</p> <p>Changed provisions for regular audits of SWMDs to- those receiving &gt;\$800,000- annual independent audit; \$800,000 to \$250,000- shall have a biennial independent audit and all other SWMDs shall be monitored biennially by the Department and based on findings in the monitoring report, the Department may arrange for an independent audit. Subject to resource limitations, the Department shall conduct performance audits at least once every 5 years or as deemed necessary by the Department based upon SWMD grantee performance.</p>
<p>Established the Solid Waste Management Fund and the funding distribution formula. Tonnage fee = \$1.50/ton for sanitary waste and \$1.00/ton for demolition waste.</p> <p>Established the Consumer Price Index (CPI) annual adjustment: CPI increases occurred 10/1/1992 - 10/1/2004 as defined in 260.330 and 260.335 RSMo</p> <p><i>(Fees are currently at \$2.11/ton for sanitary waste and \$1.40/ton for demolition waste- Oct. 2021)</i></p>	<p>Placed a moratorium on the tonnage fee CPI adjustment from 10/1/2005 through 10/1/2009 (Exception allowed for an adjustment amount consistent with the need to fund the operating costs of the Department, taking into account any annual percentage increase in the total of the volumetric equivalent of solid waste accepted in the prior year)</p>	<p>Established the definition of “Solid Waste Management Project”.</p> <p>Added “district” to the provision of providing economical waste management related to solid waste management plans.</p> <p>Under 260.250 RSMo. clarified that the term “district” means SWMD and added textiles to the list of materials that SWMDs, are to address through recycling, reuse, and handling in their solid waste management plans.</p>

SB 530 -- 1990	SB225 -- 2005	HB 92 -- 2015
		<p>Established a provision prohibiting a SWMD Executive Board from performing solid waste management projects in competition with a qualified private enterprise.</p> <p>Established a requirement of a 2/3 approval of a SWMD Executive Board for applicants with a familial relationship with any member of the SWMD Executive Board and requires members with a familial relationship to abstain from voting or forfeit their membership on the SWMD Executive Board and the SWMD Council.</p>
<p>Established a Market Development Program under the Environmental Improvement and Energy Resources Authority (EIERA) w/ interagency agreement between EIERA, Department of Economic Development, and the Department of Natural Resources on funds expenditure. \$1,000,000 allocated each year for FY 1992-1997</p>	<p>Revised formula/allocation: EIERA = \$800,000; \$200,000 made available to SWMDs receiving fewer funds under the new 2005 formula than were previously provided for under the 1990 formula.</p>	<p>Extended the moratorium on CPI adjustment to the tonnage fee through 10/1/2027 and added a "may" provision for the up to \$200,000 hold harmless funds distribution language contained in 260.335 RSMo.</p> <p>Removed a reference in 260.335 RSMo. that previously allowed allocation of funds through grants to cities and counties to only allow for allocation of funds to the SWMDs.</p> <p>Updated the effective date of the minimal SWMD funding amount of \$95,000 to 8/28/2015.</p>
	<p>39% to MDNR for all functions  61% to SWMDs  40% based on population  60% based on revenue (tonnage fees)</p>	<p>Added clarification that either the chairperson or designee from each SWMD Executive Board may be a member of SWAB.</p> <p>Changed the appointing authority for Department appointed SWAB members to the Director of the Solid Waste Management Program.</p> <p>Required that beginning on 1/1/2016, that rather than advising the Department on the criteria listed in 260.345 RSMo. that an Annual Report from SWAB will be provided to the Department and any standing, statutory, interim, or select committee or task force of the General Assembly having jurisdiction</p>

SB 530 -- 1990	SB225 -- 2005	HB 92 -- 2015
		<p>over solid waste that covers those same criteria as well as unfunded solid waste management projects.</p> <p>Established that SWAB hold regular meetings on a quarterly basis and that special meetings may occur upon a majority vote of all SWAB members at a regular quarterly meeting and that reasonable written notice of all meetings shall be given by the Department to all SWAB members. A majority of SWAB members shall constitute a quorum for transaction of business by the SWAB. All actions of the SWAB shall be taken at regular quarterly meetings open to the public.</p>
<p>Allocation funding formula established:</p> <p>Up to 10% for elimination of illegal dumping</p> <p>Up to 15% to cover administrative costs, administer grants, and administer other duties imposed in sections 260.255-260.345 and section 260.432.</p> <p>Up to 25% to provide incentives to operators of solid waste management areas to remove recyclables or reusable items. The Department shall establish procedures for applications and criteria for evaluating applications.</p> <p>At least 25% allocated through grants to cities, counties and districts through grants or loans.</p> <p>60% of the revenue generated within each region and allocable under the subsection may be allocated to the District and 40% shall be allocated to the cities and counties within the District.</p>	<p>Allocated funds to SWMDs- no more than 50% may be used for district plan and operational costs and at least 50% must be used for waste reduction, recycling, etc. in cities and counties.</p>	

SB 530 -- 1990	SB225 -- 2005	HB 92 -- 2015
The remaining moneys in the fund shall be used to provide grants or loans for solid waste management projects to any district, county, or city or to any person or entity involved in waste reduction or recycling to further the purposes of 260.255 to 260.345.		
Minimal funding for each SWMD-- \$45,000	Minimal funding for each SWMD-- \$95,000	
<b>Other solid waste related changes made by these bills</b>		
Banned the following items from landfill disposal: 1/1/1991- lead acid batteries, major appliances, waste oil, and whole waste tires. 1/1/1992- yard waste	Changed “waste tire” to “scrap tire” throughout the applicable statutes. Reinstated the tire fee at \$0.50, required the Department to report on scrap tire cleanups by 1/1/2009, and set a fee expiration of January 2010. Add financial assurance requirements to scrap tire end-user and processing facilities. Added a provision allowing the Department Director authority to use any unencumbered moneys in the tire fund for public health, environmental, and safety projects in response to environmental emergencies. Established bidder preference points for contractors meeting certain conditions, such as headquartered or principle place of business in Missouri for at least 2 years preceding the bid submittal for scrap tire cleanup contracts.	Provided authority to the administrative hearing commission to hear petitions under 260.235.
Updated definitions in 260.200 RSMo.  Updated permitting provisions for solid waste disposal and processing facilities in 260.205 RSMo.  Established a habitual violator clause, reporting, contracting restrictions, and a definition used to prohibit issuance of permits to any	Created a \$0.50 lead acid battery fee that became effective 10/1/2005 and terminated on 6/30/2011.	

SB 530 -- 1990	SB225 -- 2005	HB 92 -- 2015
person meeting the provisions in 260.207 and 260.208 RSMo.		
Established that cities and counties acquiring property in other cities and counties are subject to and shall comply with the zoning and ordinances in those cities and counties 260.209 RSMo.	Removed the authority for statewide solid waste management planning and research projects grants	
Established criminal penalties for illegal disposal of solid waste and property disclosure requirements for solid waste disposal areas (permitted or unpermitted) when selling the property 260.211, 260.212, and 260.213 RSMo.	Established that except for the amount up to one-fourth of the department's previous fiscal year expense, any remaining unencumbered funds generated under subdivision (1) of subsection 2 of 260.335 in prior fiscal years shall be reallocated under 260.335.	
Modified the duties of the Department under 260.225 RSMo.	Removed the authority for a joint legislative committee to consider fee proposals and restructuring.	
Established permit restrictions and a buffer requirement for commercial solid waste incinerators 260.243 RSMo.	Removed authority for issuing unencumbered funds generated during prior fiscal years by the fees established under section 260.330 through grants or loans to solid waste management areas and processing facilities, municipalities, counties, districts, and other appropriate persons who demonstrate a need for assistance to comply with section 260.250. Such grants or loans were to be used for educational programs, transportation, low-interest or no-interest loans to purchase property for composting or other solid waste source reduction activities stated to facilitate compliance with section 260.250	
Established Newspaper recycled content target levels and reporting requirements starting on 1/1/1994 260.255 RSMo.	Changed requirements related to appointed members of SWAB - two members shall represent the solid waste management industry, and one member may represent the solid waste composting or recycling industry.	

SB 530 -- 1990	SB225 -- 2005	HB 92 -- 2015
	Removed the termination requirement for any appointed member failing to make at least 50% of the meetings each calendar year.	
<p>Established lead acid battery recycling and take back requirements for retailers.</p> <p>Established the scrap tire program (providing authority to the Department to develop regulations for collection, storage and processing, transportation, permitting requirements, financial assurance requirements, permit fees, highway demonstration and end-user projects, and established the fee for new tires sold at retail 260.270 to 260.276 RSMo.</p>		

## ATTACHMENT F

## SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICTS

# Solid Waste Management Districts



District	Chair	Planner	Contact
District A	Debbie Roach	Robin Davidson	660-582-5121 x4
District B	Nelson Heil	Angela Shoultz	660-359-5636 x19
District C	Mark Thompson	Marla Greiner	660-465-7281 x5
District D	Kyle White	Brenda Kennedy	816-393-5250
District E	Doug Wylie	Lisa McDaniel	816-474-4240
District F	Jim Marcum	Joni Wansing	660-619-3652
District G	Alan Wyatt	Ashley Long	573-565-2203
District H	Lelande Rehard	Elise Buchheit	573-817-6422
District I	Lon Little	Chad Eggen	636-456-3473
District J	Brad True	Shannon Stewart	417-298-6070
District K	Brady Wilson	Tammy Snodgrass	573-265-2993
District L	Eric Larson	Dave Berger	314-645-6753
District M	Joe Hardin	Patty Overman	417-625-6626
District N	Scott Starrett	Natalie Moseley	417-236-9012
District O	Erick Roberts	Angie Snyder	417-868-4197
District P	Gary Collins	Tegan Vaughn	417-256-4226
District Q	Brian Polk	Andrew Murphy	573-785-6402
District R	Happy Welch	Josh Thompson	573-547-8357
District S	Kent Hampton	Kent Luke	573-614-5178 x102
District T	Tom Wright	Joni Wansing	573-723-0079